A Reading Guide

For The Most Confused Subjects of

Marxism Leninism

On Revolutionary Situation
On Restoration of Capitalism
On Imperialism
On Bureaucracy
On Anti-Imperialist Wars
On Imperialist Wars and Bolsheviks
On Socialism in One Country
On Boycott
On Compromise
On The Right to Self Determination
On Democratic Struggle
On Reform and Reformism
On National Question and Bundists
On Standing Army
On Parliamentarism and Parliamentary Struggle
On People Democracy, Insurrection & Revolutionary Democracy

Erdogan A

A Reading Guide

For the Most Confused Subjects of

Marxism Leninism

Introductions
and
Extensive List of Articles related to each subject

Erdogan A

This book is the summary of sixteen books and made up of introductions and the list of related articles. It is basically a reference to the books with entire related articles in them.

Notes and articles for some subjects categorized based on the years due to its context; The Years of Organizing – Pre 1903, The years of preparation of the revolution (1903-05), The years of reaction (1907–10), The First Imperialist World War (1914–17), The second revolution in Russia (February to October 1917), After revolution

Articles, if not specified, belongs to Lenin

"P" or "Pages" refer to the location of articles in the books for quick find and access.

Subjects

On Revolutionary Situation **-P3**

On Imperialism -**P25**

On Anti-Imperialist Wars- **P41**

On Imperialist Wars and Bolsheviks-**P 58**

On Boycott-***P 66***

On Bureaucracy -**P79**

On Compromise -**P97**

On Democratic Struggle- **P107**

On Parliamentarism and Parliamentary Struggle -**P130**

On People Democracy, Insurrection & Revolutionary Democracy- **P162**

On Reform and Reformism- **P 216**

On Restoration of Capitalism- **P226**

On Right to Self Determination-National Question-**P250**

On National Question and Bundists -**P274**

On Socialism in One Country- **P293**

On Standing Army -**P304**

On Revolutionary Situation

> "It is the ABC of Marxism that the tactics of the socialist proletariat cannot be the same both when there is a revolutionary situation and when there is no revolutionary situation." *Lenin (18)*

As in general, determining the path of revolution in particular constitutes important and decisive factors in the formation of the political line of the revolutionary party. Marxist-Leninist party or organization cannot play an important role in the development of the proletariat and the revolutionary struggle of the people without a clear strategic line because the correct tactics can be defined and applied to life on the basis of strategic line.

The strategic line essentially identifies key contradictions in a concrete process. While drawing the strategic line of the party, or organization, it decides its specific goals and strategic tasks depending on the general, determines the main enemy and driving forces of the revolution and the internal and external allies of the working class in particular. Therefore, the strategy refers to the path of the revolution, that is, the nature of the struggle to radically transform the existing social conditions, to undertake the task of eliminating capitalist exploitation and building socialism. As Stalin defines; "Strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves. It changes with the passing of the revolution from one stage to another but remains basically unchanged throughout a given stage." *Stalin,(19)*

Tactics consist of determining the tools to be used to advance towards strategic goals, the forms of organization to be adopted and the struggle to overcome problems in each given specific conditions. As Stalin defines; "Tactics deal with the forms of struggle and the forms of organization of the proletariat, with

their changes and combinations. During a given stage of the revolution tactics may change several times, depending on the flow or ebb, the rise or decline, of the revolution." *Stalin, (19)*

In particular, the assessment of "revolutionary situation" is the mother of all assessments. Every form and tactics related to the revolutionary struggle in a given concrete situation is determined by the assessment of the "Revolutionary Situation" - the existing objective and subjective conditions - at that given time, not by abstract slogans learned by rote to serve the petty bourgeois inclinations. "If we are to remain true to Marxism" says Lenin, "we cannot and should not try, by resorting to generalities, to shirk the task of analyzing the objective conditions; for, in the last analysis, the appraisal of these conditions provides the final answer to the questions." *Lenin, (20)*

It is a common habit of vacillating petty bourgeois in general and variations of Trotskyism in particular to call on people to revolution where there is no revolutionary situation, and to reject uprising where there is revolutionary situation. Turkey, where once was a castle of Stalinists with full of active struggle and following where Trotskyism and its open and hidden variations mushroomed after 1990s serves as a concrete example to this habit. Trots and variations are calling for "socialist revolution" in order to topple the religious autocracy based on the factual argument that the parliament is not active and that alone constitutes the existence of "revolutionary situation".

Contrary to Trotskyites and its variations' claim, Lenin states;

> "We must not appraise the revolutionary situation in the country from the standpoint of what goes on in the Duma. On the contrary, we must appraise questions and incidents that arise in the Duma from the

> standpoint of the revolutionary situation in the country." *Lenin, [14]*

One does not have to be a scholar of Marxism Leninism in order to respond to the question of "What could be the "Revolutionary Situation " in a country where over % 99 of the population have deep illusion of parliamentarism, over % 50 of it is not only reactionary but actively counter revolutionary, % 25+- of the remaining is mainly interested in "bourgeois democratic rights" related to themselves, most of the rest believe in "parliamentary road to socialism" , and there is no strong ML Party embracing the large masses. These are the objective and subjective conditions at this given concrete conditions which constitutes the non-existence of revolutionary situation. As Lenin puts it;

> "Marx's method consists, first of all, in taking due account of the objective content of a historical process at a given moment, in definite and concrete conditions; this in order to realise, in the first place, the movement of which class is the mainspring of the progress possible in those concrete conditions." *Lenin, (21)*

It is not the far-left agitations, one or more existing crisis, but it is the totality of all the changes in objective and subjective conditions that constitutes a revolutionary situation. As Lenin explains; "it is neither chance nor the result of any demagogy or agitation, but the objective conditions of the crisis brought about by the war and the sharpening of class contradictions that now generate strikes, demonstrations and other similar manifestations of mass revolutionary struggle." *Lenin, (2)*

The general crisis of capitalism, the trend of which will become steadily deeper makes us draw the general conclusion that the revolutionary situation and thus the socialist revolution is on the agenda. However, what is on the agenda in general, may or

may not be in the agenda in particular, assessment for which is called "revolutionary situation".

What is "revolutionary situation?"

"To the Marxist" Lenin says," it is indisputable that a revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation; furthermore, it is not every revolutionary situation that leads to revolution. What, generally speaking, are the symptoms of a revolutionary situation? We shall certainly not be mistaken if we indicate the following three major symptoms:

> 1) when it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule without any change; when there is a crisis, in one form or another, among the "upper classes", a crisis in the policy of the ruling class, leading to a fissure through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes burst forth. For a revolution to take place, it is usually insufficient for "the lower classes not to want" to live in the old way; it is also necessary that "the upper classes should be unable" to live in the old way;
>
> 2) when the suffering and want of the oppressed classes have grown more acute than usual;
>
> 3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who uncomplainingly allow themselves to be robbed in "peace time", but, in turbulent times, are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis and by the "upper classes" themselves into independent historical action.
>
> Without these objective changes, which are independent of the will, not only of individual groups and parties but even of individual classes, a revolution, as a general rule, is impossible. The totality of all these

> objective changes is called a revolutionary situation." *Lenin, (22)*
>
> And "without these objective changes, which are independent of the will, not only of individual groups and parties but even of individual classes, a revolution, as a general rule, is impossible. The totality of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation." Lenin, Page 162 Lenin stresses the fact that the "objective conditions" alone is not sufficient for the arising of "revolutionary situation; " it is not every revolutionary situation that gives rise to a revolution; revolution arises only out of a situation in which the above-mentioned objective changes are accompanied by a subjective change, namely, the ability of the revolutionary class to take revolutionary mass action strong enough to break (or dislocate) the old government, which never, not even in a period of crisis, "falls", if it is not toppled over." *(22)*

Apart from the Trotskyites in varying shades who hide behind far-left slogans and gamble on the future and life of laboring masses from afar, Marxist Leninists do not take the issue of Revolution and the analysis of objective and subjective conditions for the revolutionary situation lightly. As Enver Hodja well puts it;

> "While adhering unwaveringly to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the violent revolution as a universal law, the revolutionary party of the working class is resolutely opposed to adventurism and never plays with armed insurrection. In all conditions and circumstances, it carries out an unceasing revolutionary struggle and activity in various forms, in order to prepare itself and the masses for the decisive battles in the revolution, for the overthrow of the rule of the

> bourgeoisie with revolutionary violence. But only when the revolutionary situation has fully matured does it put armed insurrection directly on the order of the day and take all the political, ideological, organizational, and military measures to carry it through to victory." Enver Hodja, [1]

Lenin points the essence of tactical approach in two different situation.

> "Today there is no revolutionary situation, the conditions that cause unrest among the masses or heighten their activities do not exist; today you are given a ballot paper—take it, learn to organise so as to use it as a weapon against your enemies, not as a means of getting cushy legislative jobs for men who cling to their parliamentary seats for fear of having to go to prison. Tomorrow your ballot paper is taken from you and you are given a rifle or a splendid and most up-to-date quick-firing gun—take this weapon of death and destruction, pay no heed to the mawkish snivelers who are afraid of war; too much still remains in the world that must be destroyed with fire and sword for the emancipation of the working class; if anger and desperation grow among the masses, if a revolutionary situation arises, prepare to create new organisations and use these useful weapons of death and destruction against your own government and your own bourgeoisie." Lenin, (22)

In summarizing the assessment of revolutionary situation in totality– both objective and subjective conditions, Lenin says that "We must examine: firstly, the nature of the present revolutionary situation from the standpoint of the general tendencies of social, economic and political development; secondly, the political grouping of classes (and parties) in

Russia today; thirdly, the basic tasks of the Social-Democratic Labour Party in this situation and with this political grouping of the social forces." *Lenin, (23)*

Objective conditions

Lenin in his response to P. Nezhdanov who charged Marx and Lenin with inconsistency, states;

> "the connection nevertheless exists, even if it is indirect; consumption must, in the final analysis, follow production, and. if the productive forces are driving towards an unlimited growth of production, while consumption is restricted by the proletarian condition of the masses of the people, there is undoubtedly a contradiction present. This contradiction does not signify the impossibility of capitalism, but it does signify that its transformation to a higher form is a necessity: the stronger this contradiction becomes, the more developed become the objective conditions for this transformation, as well as the subjective conditions, i.e., the workers' consciousness of this contradiction." *Lenin, [15]*

Stating the general assessment that "the period of imperialism i.e., one in which, as all Marxists hold, the objective conditions are ripe for the collapse of capitalism, and there are masses of socialist proletarians", he stresses in particular that "not the desires of individuals or groups, but the objective conditions of the epoch give rise to the struggle." (24) That's why, "We must study the objective conditions .. on the basis of this objective analysis, we must separate the erroneous ideology of the different classes from the real content of the economic, changes, and determine what, on the basis of those real economic

changes, is required for the development of the productive forces and for the proletarian class struggle." (25) And "when there are objective conditions for a direct revolutionary onslaught by the masses, the Party's supreme political task is "to serve the spontaneous movement". To contrast such revolutionary work with "politics" is to reduce politics to chicanery. It means exalting political action in the Duma above the political action of the masses in October and December; in other words, it means abandoning the proletarian revolutionary standpoint for that of intellectualist opportunism."(26) Because "the employment of one or other means of struggle depends on the objective conditions of the particular crisis, economic or political, precipitated by the war, and not on any previous decision that revolutionaries may have made." [3]. And "every form of struggle requires a corresponding technique and a corresponding apparatus. When objective conditions make the parliamentary struggle the principal form of struggle, the features of the apparatus for parliamentary struggle inevitably become more marked in the Party. When, on the other hand, objective conditions give rise to a struggle of the masses in the form of mass political strikes and uprisings, the party of the proletariat must have an "apparatus" to "serve" these forms of struggle, and, of course, this must be a special "apparatus", not resembling the parliamentary one. An organised party of the proletariat which admitted that the conditions existed for popular uprisings and yet failed to set up the necessary apparatus would be a party of intellectualist chatterboxes; the workers would abandon it and go over to anarchism, bourgeois revolutionism, etc." *Lenin, (26)*

> "regardless of the will and the consciousness, the dreams and the theories, of the various individuals" says Lenin, "Marx strives in a sober, materialist manner to deter mine its real historical content, the consequences that must inevitably follow from it

> because of objective conditions." Lenin, Marx on the American "General Redistribution" Because, "The objective conditions of social life and the class struggle are more powerful than pious intentions and written programmes." *Lenin, (27)*

Through concrete assessments of the existing conditions without leaving the real ground, Lenin says, "we have also learned, at least to some extent, another art that is essential in revolution, namely, flexibility, the ability to effect swift and sudden changes of tactics if changes in objective conditions demand them, and to choose another path for the achievement of our goal if the former path proves to be inexpedient or impossible at the given moment." *(28)*

Weighing the importance of each conditions with the example of conversion of imperialist war into civil war, Lenin states, "One must be able to uphold the Marxist point of view, which says that this conversion of imperialist war into a civil war should be based on objective, and not subjective, conditions." *[4]*

Subjective Conditions

The creation of the subjective conditions of the struggle for the seizure of power is related to the activities for the working class gaining revolutionary consciousness, understanding the significance of economic, political, and ideological problems, and reaching certain level of revolutionary maturity and sound vanguard organization. Even the objective conditions are ripe, without the existence of subjective conditions a revolution or success of revolution is not possible.

> "Some people think that it is enough to note the objective process of extinction of the class in power in order to launch the attack. But that is wrong" says Lenin. "In addition to this, the subjective conditions

> necessary for a successful attack must have been prepared. It is precisely the task of strategy and tactics skillfully and opportunely to make the preparation of the subjective conditions for attacks fit in with the objective processes of the extinction of the power of the ruling class." *Lenin, (29)*
>
> "In preparing the subjective factor, as Lenin wrote in his early works, the revolutionary party of the working class, its leadership, education, and Mobilization of the revolutionary masses play a decisive role. The party achieves this both by working out a correct political line, which responds to the concrete conditions and the revolutionary desires and demands of the masses, and through a colossal amount of work, involving intensive and politically well-pondered revolutionary actions, which make the proletariat and the working masses conscious of the situation in which they are living, of the oppression and exploitation, of the barbarous laws of the bourgeoisie, and the absolute necessity for the revolution as a means to overthrow the enslaving order." Enver Hoxha, *[1]*

When objective and subjective conditions for revolutionary situation exist

> "one of the main tasks .. in every revolutionary situation must be to arm the people and to strengthen the military organisations of the proletariat" *[16]*, because "whether we like it or not, and in spite of all "directives", the acute revolutionary situation is bound to convert a demonstration into a strike, a protest into a fight, a strike into an uprising." *[17]* and "in order to be able to exercise this pressure from below, the proletariat must be armed—for in a revolutionary situation matters develop with exceptional rapidity to the stage of open

> civil war—and must be led by the Social-Democratic Party." *Lenin, (29)*

As Stalin notes in his reply to Sverdlov Comrades; "No hard and fast line can be drawn between a "revolutionary upsurge" and a "direct revolutionary situation." One cannot say: "Up to this paint we have a revolutionary upsurge; beyond it, we have a leap to a direct revolutionary situation." Only scholastics can put the question in that way. The first usually passes "imperceptibly" into the second. The task is to prepare the proletariat at once for decisive revolutionary battles, without waiting for the "onset" of what is called a direct revolutionary situation." *(30)*

> As it is clear, in example of Turkey Trots' call for a revolution by itself is meaningless not only because it totally ignores the existing objective and subjective conditions, but not calling for "arming the people" for the revolution (that may be because while they are sitting in their comfortable homes, they expect the standing Turkish "army will switch side "and carry out the revolution(*see "Lenin vs Trotsky on Standing Army"*).

If the revolutionary situation existed to some degree, they would have been right to boycott the elections and call for revolution. As Lenin explains;

> "By the force of circumstances, of the revolutionary situation, there will be no elections at the "election" meetings; they will be transformed into meetings for party agitation outside of and despite the elections; in other words, the result will be what is called "active boycott".
>
> The realities of the revolutionary and counter revolutionary situation prove, more convincingly than any number of arguments, that dreams about

> participating in the Duma for the purpose of fighting are futile, and that the tactics of active boycott are correct. *"[5]*

As far as them calling everyone else, including the opposition to the religious autocracy as "fascist", and thus suggest that "Marxist Leninists cannot compromise", it would have been correct to some degree if the revolutionary conditions were there. As Lenin explains;

> "The communist resolution says that the revolutionary situation calls for greater homogeneity in the party. That is undeniable. The resolution of those who advocate "unity" with the reformists attempts to evade this undeniable truth, without daring to dispute it.
>
> The Communist resolution says that it is a feature of the situation in Italy that the condition demanding submission to party decisions by the reformists has not been observed. That is the gist of the matter. That being so, it is not merely a mistake but a crime to allow the reformists to remain in the party at a time when the general revolutionary situation is becoming acute, and the country may even be on the eve of decisive revolutionary battles." *[6]*

Marxist Leninists do not leave the real ground and do not set forth tactics without the concrete assessment of concrete conditions.

When objective and subjective conditions lack

Lenin, in his article "A Basic Question" gives an enlightening example;

> "What classes do the Russian working masses consist of? Everybody knows that they consist of workers and peasants. Which of these classes is in the majority? The

> peasants. Who are these peasants as far as their class position is concerned? Petty proprietors. The question arises: if the petty proprietors constitute the majority of the population and if the objective conditions for socialism are lacking, then how can the majority of the population declare in favour of socialism? Who can say anything or who says anything about establishing socialism against the will of the majority?" *[7]*

Considering the conditions in example of Turkey where neither objective nor subjective conditions exists, Trots must be proposing a socialism against the will of %99 thru military putsch.

When the conditions of revolutionary situation non-exists, Lenin explains the task at the given time in Russia;

"The present new conditions require new forms of struggle. The use of the Duma tribune is an absolute necessity. A prolonged effort to educate and organise the masses of the proletariat becomes particularly important. The combination of illegal and legal organisation raises special problems before the Party. The popularization and clarification of the experience of the revolution, which the liberals and liquidationist intellectuals are seeking to discredit, are necessary both for theoretical and practical purposes. But the tactical line of the Party—which must be able to take the new conditions into account in its methods and means of struggle—remains unchanged. The correctness of revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics, states one of the resolutions of the conference, is confirmed by the experience of the mass struggle in 1905-07. The defeat of the revolution resulting from this first campaign revealed, not that the tasks were wrong, not that the immediate aims were "utopian", not that the methods and means were mistaken, but that the forces were insufficiently prepared, that the revolutionary crisis was insufficiently wide and deep… Let

the liberals and terrified intellectuals lose heart after the first genuinely mass battle for freedom, let them repeat like cowards: don't go where you have been beaten before, don't tread that fatal path again. The class-conscious proletariat will answer them: the great wars in history, the great problems of revolutions, were solved only by the advanced classes returning to the attack again and again—and they achieved victory after having learned the lessons of defeat. Defeated armies learn well. The revolutionary classes of Russia have been defeated in their first campaign, but the revolutionary situation remains. In new forms and by other ways, sometimes much more slowly than we would wish, the revolutionary crisis is approaching, coming to a head again. We must carry on with the lengthy work of preparing larger masses for that crisis; this preparation must be more serious, taking account of higher and more concrete tasks; and the more successfully we do this work, the more certain will be our victory in the new struggle." *[8]*

Wars can be a trigger for the intensification of objective and subjective conditions. An imperialist war, "among the Great Powers.. is creating a revolutionary situation, is engendering revolutionary sentiments and unrest in the masses", Lenin, The Draft Resolution of the Left Wing at Zimmerwald "the war itself has begun to teach, and is teaching, the masses the lesson of revolution, by creating a revolutionary situation and by expanding and deepening it." *[10]*

The importance of waging struggle for the creation of subjective conditions is that due to the nature of capitalism objective conditions could rise unexpectedly, and without the existence of subjective conditions, bourgeoisie will be able to stop the spontaneous uprisings either by force or by giving some concessions. In the case of Russian example, Lenin comments; "A revolutionary situation was maturing in the country and the tsarist government, preferring to free the peasants "from

above" rather than wait till they took action "from below," was preparing for the abolition of serfdom (the so-called Peasant Reform)." *[11].*

Assessing the revolutionary situation in any given time, "history" says Lenin, "is not to be convinced by speeches, …we see that to play with words and wave a cardboard sword is useless." *[12]*

The tactics in both conditions determined with the interests of the laboring masses and their struggle in mind, that's to say, revolutionary in context subordinated to socialist tasks. That's why, "It is far more difficult—and far more precious—to be a revolutionary when the conditions for direct, open, really mass and really revolutionary struggle do not yet exist, to be able to champion the interests of the revolution (by propaganda, agitation and organisation) in non-revolutionary bodies, and quite often in downright reactionary bodies, in a non-revolutionary situation, among the masses who are incapable of immediately appreciating the need for revolutionary methods of action." *[13]*

When there are no objective or subjective conditions for revolution

It is no coincidence that Lenin's assessments at each phase of revolution for the tactics differ and seems contradictory to those who lack the application of Marxist dialectics in connection with the revolutionary situation. Let's read Stalin in reference to the importance of the creation of subjective conditions:

"The first period was the period of formation, of the creation of our Party. It embraces the interval of time approximately from the foundation of Iskra to the Third Party Congress inclusively (end of 1900 to beginning of 1905).

In this period the Party, as a driving force, was weak. It was weak not only because it itself was young, but also because the working-class movement as a whole was young and because the revolutionary situation, the revolutionary movement, was lacking, or little developed, particularly in the initial stages of this period (the peasantry was silent or did not go beyond sullen murmuring; the workers conducted only partial economic strikes or political strikes covering a whole town; the forms of the movement were of an underground or semi-legal character; the forms of working-class organisation were also mainly of an underground character).

The Party's strategy—since strategy presupposes the existence of reserves and the possibility of maneuvering with them—was necessarily narrow and restricted. The Party confined itself to mapping the movement's strategic plan, i.e., the route that the movement should take; and the Party's reserves—the contradictions within the camp of the enemies inside and outside of Russia—remained unused, or almost unused, owing to the weakness of the Party.

The Party ‘s tactics, since tactics presuppose the utilisation of all forms of the movement, forms of proletarian organisation, their combination and mutual supplementation, etc., with the object of winning the masses and ensuring strategic success, were also necessarily narrow and without scope.

In this period the Party focused its attention and care upon the Party itself, upon its own existence and preservation. At this stage it regarded itself as a kind of self-sufficing force. That was natural: tsarism's fierce attacks upon the Party, and the Mensheviks' efforts to blow it up from within and to replace the Party cadres with an amorphous, non-Party body... threatened the Party's very existence and, as a consequence, the question of preserving the Party acquired paramount importance in this period.

The principal task of communism in Russia in that period was to recruit into the Party the best elements of the working class, those who were most active and most devoted to the cause of the proletariat; to form the ranks of the proletarian party and to put it firmly on its feet. Comrade Lenin formulates this task as follows: "to win the vanguard of the proletariat to the side of communism" (see "Left-Wing" Communism.). "*Stalin, (31)*

And Lenin; "Even in peacetime, when there is no revolutionary situation, the mass struggle of the workers against the capitalists—for instance, the mass strike—gives rise to great bitterness on both sides, to fierce passions in the struggle, the bourgeoisie constantly insisting that they remain and mean to remain "masters in their own house", etc. "

"And in time of revolution, when political life reaches boiling point, an organisation like the Soviets, which embraces all the workers in all branches of industry, all the soldiers, and all the working and poorest sections of the rural population—such an organisation, of its own accord, with the development of the struggle, by the simple "logic" of attack and defense, comes inevitably to pose the question point-blank. The attempt to take up a middle position and to "reconcile" the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is sheer stupidity and doomed to miserable failure." *Lenin, (18)*

Conclusion

Determining the path of revolution in particular constitutes decisive factors in the formation of the political line of the revolutionary party and its strategic line. The strategic line identifies key contradictions in a concrete process which remains basically unchanged throughout a given stage. Tactics to be used to advance towards these strategic goal changes in each given specific conditions. In order to determine the correct tactics for the strategy in the path of revolution, assessment of

each concrete situation is made - not the assessment of each specific issue by itself but with its dialectic connections to other issues. As Lenin explains, assessment "like every other political question, must be considered by Marxists concretely and not abstractly, taking into account the entire revolutionary situation as a whole." *Lenin, (32)*

Assessment for a call to revolution -maximum program - requires the existence of both objective and subjective conditions for it. When there is no revolutionary condition struggle is for -minimal program- the creation of subjective conditions and thus intensifying the objective conditions. As Lenin clearly explains; "by making implementation of the minimum program provisional revolutionary government's task eliminates the absurd, semi-anarchist ideas about giving immediate effect to the maximum program, and the conquest of power for a socialist revolution. The degree of economic development .. (an objective condition) and the degree of class consciousness and organisation of the broad masses of the proletariat (a subjective condition inseparably connected with the objective condition) make the immediate complete emancipation of the working class impossible." *Lenin, (29)*

Confronting the democratic tasks and tactics for it when there is no "revolutionary situation" with calls for "revolution" is typical to Trotskyites to hide behind far-left mask and do nothing. Same Trots deny the proletarian alliance with the poor peasantry where peasantry still significant, and yet declare the peasantry "vanguard" of revolution where proletariat is significant. Unfortunately, despite the fact that their counter-revolutionary mask has been exposed, they still influence the petty bourgeois and likewise far-left organizations' approaches.

Marxist Leninists believe in the concrete assessment of every concrete situation, without leaving the factual ground in order

to determine the tactics to be employed at a given situation. The assessment of "revolutionary situation" is the mother of all assessment to which every assessment has to be connected. Every assessment proceeds from the concrete assessment of existing objective and subjective conditions.

As both Marx and Lenin summarizes, regardless of the will and the consciousness, the dreams and the theories of the various individuals, the consequences follow from the objective conditions, because the objective conditions of social life and the class struggle are more powerful than pious intentions and written programmes. The degree of class consciousness and organisation of the broad masses of the proletariat that makes up the subjective condition is inseparably connected with the objective condition, and only their totality becomes decisive in the success of a revolution.

Notes and Related Articles to Read

[1] Enver Hodja, Imperialism, and revolution

[2] Lenin, The Second International Socialist Conference at Kienthal

[3] Lenin, The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart.

[4] Lenin, The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)

[5] Lenin, The State Duma, and Social-Democratic Tactics

[6] Lenin, On the Struggle of the Italian Socialist Party

[7] Lenin, A Basic Question

[8] Lenin, On the Road

[9] Lenin, The Draft Resolution of the Left Wing at Zimmerwald

[10] Lenin, The Voice of an Honest French Socialist

[11] Lenin, Remarks on Books: G. V. Plekhanov.

[12] Lenin, Extraordinary Fourth All-Russia Congress of Soviets,

[13] Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism: an Infantile Disorder

[14] Lenin, The Workers' Group in the State Duma

[15] Lenin, Reply to Mr. P. Nezhdanov

[16] Lenin, A Tactical Platform for the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.

[17] Lenin, The Dissolution of the Duma, and the Tasks of the Proletariat

(18) Lenin, The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, November 1918 – Page 227

(19) Stalin, The Foundations of Leninism, 1924 – Page 263

(20) Lenin, The Russian Revolution, and the Tasks of the Proletariat March 1906 – Page 47

(21) Lenin, Under a False Flag, February 1915 – Page 152

(22) Lenin, The Collapse of the Second International, June 1915 – Page 162

(23) Lenin, The Platform of Revolutionary Social-Democracy, March 1907 – Page 73

(24) Lenin, To the Russian Collegium of the C.C February 1911 -Page 127

(25) Lenin, The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907, December 1907 – Page 78

(26) Lenin, The Crisis of Menshevism, December 1906 – Page 190

(27) Lenin, How the Socialist-Revolutionaries Sum Up the Revolution and How the Revolution has Summed Them Up January 1909 – Page 101

(28) Lenin, Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution, October 1921 – Page 243

(29) Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, July 1905 – Page 39

(30) Stalin, Reply to the Sverdlov Comrades, February 10, 1930 – Page 290

(31) Stalin, The Party Before &After Taking Power, August 1921 – Page 279

(32) Lenin, Two Letters, November 1908 – Page 83

Lenin, Report on the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P, A Letter to the St. Petersburg Workers, May 1906 – Page 59

Lenin, The Platform of the Reformists and the Platform of the Revolutionary Social-Democrats, November 1912 – Page130

Lenin, Opportunism, and the Collapse of the Second International, December 1915 – Page 174

Lenin, Marxism and Insurrection, A Letter to the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), September 1917 – Page 218

Lenin, Afterword to The Theses on The Question Of The Immediate Conclusion Of A Separate And Annexationist Peace, January 1918 – Page 225

Lenin, Our Revolution, (Apropos of N. Sukhanov's Notes), January 1923 – Page 258

Lenin, The Third Congress, May 1905 - Page 22

Lenin, On the Provisional Revolutionary Government, June 1905 – Page 30

Lenin, The Workers' Group in the State Duma, May 1906 – Page 68

Lenin, Two Worlds, November 1910 – Page 117

Lenin, May Day Action by the Revolutionary Proletariat, June 1913- Page 141

Lenin, May day and the war, April 1915 - Page 160

Lenin, Wilhelm Kolb 6 George Plekhanov, February 29, 1916 – Page 216

Lenin, Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism, January 1, 1923 – Page 253

On Imperialism

The definition of "imperialism" used in order to determine if a country is imperialist or not generally is limited to its economic aspect, disregarding the "political" aspect. Lenin in his forward to Imperialism stated that "pamphlet was written with an eye to the tsarist censorship. Hence," he said, "I was not only forced to confine myself strictly to an exclusively theoretical, specifically economic analysis of facts, but to formulate the few necessary observations on politics with extreme caution… I trust that this pamphlet will help the reader to understand the fundamental economic question, that of the economic essence of imperialism." (1)

Lenin was pointing this out by saying; "imperialism can and must be defined differently if we bear in mind not only the basic, purely economic concepts—to which the above definition is limited.." (1)

It was Lenin himself saying that his "imperialism" and definition is limited to economic aspect of it. In reference to Imperialism, and importance of this question Lenin points out that;

> "The problem of imperialism is not only a most essential one, but, we may say it is the most essential problem in that realm of economic science which examines the changing forms of capitalism in recent times. Everyone interested not only in economics but in any sphere of present-day social life must acquaint himself with the facts relating to this problem, as presented by the author in such detail on the basis of the latest available data. Needless to say that there can be no concrete historical analysis of war, if that analysis does not have for its basis a full understanding of the nature of imperialism, both from its economic and political aspects. Without

> this, it is impossible to approach an understanding of the economic and diplomatic situation of the last decades, and without such an understanding, it is ridiculous even to speak of forming a correct view on the war." (2)

In his critique of Kautsky he summarized the policy in one word- use of force.

> ""Imperialism is a striving for annexations… It is correct, but very incomplete, for politically, imperialism is, in general, a striving towards violence and reaction.".. The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics…Finance capital and the trusts do not diminish but increase the differences in the rate of growth of the various parts of the world economy. Once the relation of forces is changed, what other solution of the contradictions can be found under capitalism than that of force?" *(1)*

Bukharin in his book which the introduction is written by Lenin, deals with the definitions of imperialism. He states

> The second very widespread "theory" of imperialism defines it as the policy of conquest in general… Simple as this theory may be, it is absolutely untrue. It is untrue because it "explains" everything, i.e., it explains absolutely nothing.
>
> Every policy of the ruling classes ("pure" policy, military policy, economic policy) has a perfectly definite functional significance… War serves to reproduce definite relations of production. War of conquest serves to reproduce those relations on a wider scale. Simply to define war, however, as conquest is entirely insufficient, for the simple reason that in doing so we fail to indicate

> the main thing, namely, what production relations are strengthened or extended by the war, what basis is widened by a given "policy of conquest… Bourgeois science does not see and does not wish to see this. It does not understand that a basis for the classification of various "policies" must exist in the social economy out of which the "policies" arise. " (3)

Defining imperialism as a "specific historic category" he points out the mistakes of approach which coincidently mistakes of our days too. He states that Imperialism; "upholds the structure of finance capital; it subjugates the world to the domination of finance capital; in place of the old capitalist, production relations, it puts the production relations of finance capital. Just as finance capitalism (which must not be confused with money capital, for finance capital is characterized by being simultaneously banking and industrial capital) is an historically limited epoch, confined only to the last few decades, so imperialism, as the policy of finance capital, is a specific historic category."

> "war is a continuation of politics by other means… Politics itself, however, is an active "continuation." (3)

An abstract repetition of "war is a continuation of politics by other means", as if it explains everything is a common ready-made solution used to all questions of wars, however, without actually studying the given "politics" itself under that given concrete conditions.

"Capitalist society" says Bukharin, "is unthinkable without armaments, as it is unthinkable without wars. And just as it is true that not low prices cause competition but, on the contrary, competition causes low prices, it is equally true that not the existence of arms is the prime cause and the moving force in wars (although wars are obviously impossible without arms)

but, on the contrary, the inevitableness of economic conflicts conditions the existence of arms. This is why in our times, when economic conflicts have reached an unusual degree of intensity, we are witnessing a mad orgy of armaments. Thus the rule of finance capital implies both imperialism and militarism. In this sense militarism is no less a typical historic phenomenon than finance capital itself… even where there are relatively equal economic structures, but the military powers of the state capitalist trusts differ considerably." (3)

Thus, Imperialism and war are inseparable twins. That is why the issue of "imperialism" and attitude to it cannot be studied independently from its political aspect- that is *(militarization of industry and)* war- in each given concrete condition and situation. Lenin was saying that "Abstract theoretical reasoning may lead to the conclusion at which Kautsky has arrived .. by abandoning Marxism. It goes without saying that there can be no concrete historical assessment of war, unless it is based on a thorough analysis of the nature of imperialism, both in its economic and political aspects." (1) Connecting the two Lenin points out that "The character of a war and its success depend chiefly upon the internal regime of the country that goes to war, that war is a reflection of the internal policy conducted by the given country before the war. " (4)

> "If they are both sides of the same coin" some will say, " then our attitude to a "war" will not be different than our attitude to "imperialism". However, Lenin clearly points out that "depending on historical conditions, the relationship of classes and similar data, the attitude towards war must be different at different times. " *(5)* That, dialectically means, the attitude to "imperialism" will be different at different times. There will be times, conditions, and situations where there is no "interests of proletariat in general" but only the "interests of

> proletariat" in particular. There will be times, conditions, and situations where, because of the existence of a "general interests of proletariat", the interests of particular will be subordinated to the interests of the general. In a constantly changing world the conditions and situations will change, so the attitude to each will have to be changed. That is why, "it is not surprising" says Lenin, " that Marx and the Marxists confined themselves to determining which bourgeoisie's victory would be more harmless to (or more favourable to) the world proletariat, at a time when one could not speak of a general proletarian movement against the governments and the bourgeoisie of all the belligerent countries." *(6)*

Lenin in his critique of Potresoy clarifies the old and new epochs and their class context in regard to Marx attitude to the wars and the question of the "the success of which bourgeoisie is more desirable" says; " Potresov has failed to notice that Marx was working on the problem at a time when there existed indubitably progressive bourgeois movements, which moreover did not merely exist, but were in the forefront of the historical process in the leading states of Europe. Today, it would be ridiculous even to imagine a progressive bourgeoisie, a progressive bourgeois movement, in, for instance, such key members of the "Concert" of Europe, as Britain and Germany." (*12)*

Marx's view and approach to the Tsarist regime as the main focus of reaction and counterrevolution in the world, and had to be fought harder than any other was not his general political line on war and peace but related to the that given concrete situation and conditions.

"In the first epoch," says Lenin, " the objective and historical task was to ascertain how, in its struggle against the chief representatives of a dying feudalism, the progressive bourgeoisie should "utilize" international conflicts so as to bring the greatest possible advantage to the entire democratic bourgeoisie of the world… the possession of colonies and the expansion of colonial possessions… The second epoch is...the deep contradictions in modern democracy… the cities were attracting ever more inhabitants, and living conditions in the large cities of the whole world were being levelled out; capital was becoming internationalized, and at the big factories townsmen and country-folk, both native and alien, were intermingling. The class contradictions were growing ever more acute… in the third epoch, no feudal fortresses of all-European significance remain… it is the task of present-day democracy to "utilize" conflicts, but this international utilization must be directed, not against individual national finance capital, but against international finance capital." (*13)*

Aside from being "the bygone period of bourgeois democratic revolutions against feudalism", during the first world war Lenin's attitude was not the same before the revolution and after the revolution. The attitude derived from not by generalized theories but from the interests of proletariat and of their struggle. First period, in the case of Russia, consideration was the interests of revolutionary struggle, second was the interests of revolution itself.

Marxist dialectical method forbids the employment of "ready-made schemes" and abstract formulas, The dialectical method demands, first, that we should consider things, not each by itself, but always in their interconnection with other things. That means even in the same epoch, the same war attitude may change as the character of war may change with the possible changes in the belligerent countries.

While criticizing Rosa Lenin was saying; "we remain dialecticians and we combat sophistry not by denying the possibility of all transformations in general, but by analysing the given phenomenon in its concrete setting and development… This "epoch" has made the policies of the present great powers thoroughly imperialist… Objectively, the feudal and dynastic wars were then opposed by revolutionary democratic wars, by wars for national liberation. This was the content of the historical tasks of that epoch. At the present time, the objective situation in the biggest advanced states of Europe is different…From the standpoint of progress, from the standpoint of the progressive class, the imperialist bourgeois war, the war of highly developed capitalism, can, objectively, be opposed only with a war against the bourgeoisie, i.e., primarily civil war for power between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.. Marxist dialectics call for a concrete analysis of each specific historical situation… Civil war against the bourgeoisie is also a form of class struggle.." *(7)*

Based on his analysis of concrete situation in that given time and conditions, the "Revolutionary Defeatism" stand of Lenin worked. "Civil war became a fact" said Lenin on Extraordinary Seventh Congress. " The transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, which we had predicted at the beginning of the revolution, and even at the beginning of the war… circumstances in which we found ourselves in October…" (*8)*

The "defeatist" stand transformed in to "Defencist" stand. "Yes, we are now defencists" said Lenin. "We have been defencists since October 25, 1917; we have won the right to defend our native land… it is a policy of preparation for defense of our country, a steadfast policy, not allowing a single step to be taken that would aid the extremist parties of the imperialist powers in the East and West." *(9)* Following, Lenin states that this "right" to "defend" from the "defeatist" stand "is not

achieved by issuing declarations, but only by overthrowing the bourgeoisie in one's own country. In that matter, he states; " it would be absurd to concoct a recipe, or general rule that would serve in all cases. One must have the brains to analyze the situation in each separate case." (10)

Either defeatist, or defencist or (active) neutral, stands of Marxist Leninists derive from the fundamental principle of having the interests of proletariat and of its struggle in mind when we make an evaluation for the policy and stand. It is never a narrowminded, mechanical question of which side or more like which bourgeois will be beneficial to us, it is the question of where the interests of proletariat lie – not based on abstract general theories but- based on concrete conditions.

This principle was what Stalin followed and applied during the second world war. In a very similar way to First World War, he made agreement with aggressive (Lenin calls extremist) Imperialist Germany to prepare for the 2nd imperialist World War. He reached to non-aggressive imperialists for an alliance for peace. He states;

> "A distinguishing feature of the new crisis is that it differs in many respects from the preceding one, and, moreover, differs for the worse and not for the better. …the present crisis has broken out not in time of peace, but at a time when a second imperialist war has already begun.. when all the other big capitalist powers are beginning to reorganize themselves on a war footing."
>
> "…as distinct from the preceding crisis, the present crisis is not a general one, but as yet involves chiefly the economically powerful countries which have not yet placed themselves on a war economy basis. As regards the aggressive countries, such as Japan, Germany, and Italy, who have already reorganized their economy on

> a war footing, they, because of the intense development of their war industry, are not yet experiencing a crisis of overproduction, although they are approaching it. This means that by the time the economically powerful, non-aggressive countries begin to emerge from the phase of crisis the aggressive countries, having exhausted their reserves of gold and raw material in the course of the war fever, are bound to enter a phase of very severe crisis.
>
> … It is no longer a question of competition in the markets, of a commercial war, of dumping. These methods of struggle have long been recognized as inadequate. It is now a question of a new redivision of the world, of spheres of influence and colonies, by military action...the bloc of three aggressive states came to be formed. A new redivision of the world by means of war became imminent.
>
> After the first imperialist war the victor states, primarily Britain, France, and the United States, set up a new regime in the relations between countries, the post-war peace regime. .. However, three aggressive states, Japan tore up the Nine-Power Pact, and Germany and Italy the Versailles Treaty, and the new imperialist war launched by them, upset the entire system of this post-war peace regime… The new imperialist war became a fact." (11)

The determination of the type of war was not different – it was an "imperialist war," but with distinctions from the previous imperialist war. Stalin evaluated the character of this distinction with the questions;

> To what are we to attribute this one-sided and strange character of the new imperialist war?

> How is it that the non-aggressive countries, which possess such vast opportunities, have so easily and without resistance abandoned their positions and their obligations to please the aggressors?
>
> Is it to be attributed to the weakness of the non-aggressive states? Of course not! Combined, the non-aggressive, democratic states are unquestionably stronger than the fascist states, both economically and militarily.
>
> To what then are we to attribute the systematic concessions made by these states to the aggressors? (11)

Stalin was clearly making a distinction between the *(extremist)* aggressive imperialists and non-aggressive imperialists. He explained;

> "The chief reason is that the majority of the non-aggressive countries, particularly Britain and France, have rejected the policy of collective security, the policy of collective resistance to aggressors, and have taken up a position of non-intervention, a position of "neutrality." (11)

In reference to "neutrality," "non-intervention" which is so widely used as a ready-made formulas, Stalin's explanation was enlightening;

> Formally speaking, the policy of non-intervention might be defined as follows:
>
> "Let each country defend itself against the aggressors as it likes and as best it can. That is not our affair We shall trade both with the aggressors and with their victims."
>
> But actually speaking, the policy of non-intervention means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war,

> and, consequently, transforming the war into a world war. The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work. (11)

Stalin did not have the illusion that the non-aggressive imperialists will not change its character. His policy was the policy of "utilizing" the contradictions between the imperialist powers for the best interests of the proletariat in particular and in general. Existing conditions and situations required for the duration the task to be "utilizing" the conflict, not against all international finance capital but against individual national finance capital, whereas before the October Revolution, during the first world war , it was the other way around.

Stalin clearly stated that " the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries…the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force… To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism. (14)

In brief, "imperialism" by its general and economic "definition" is not decisive in every situation and condition to determine the specific stand to be taken against.

Widely quoted and repeated definition of imperialism by Lenin is largely limited to its economic aspects of it. Especially the fifth condition "already completed division of the world", refers to the "victories imperialists" for an epoch that is completed. One cannot use that for China, for example, because China was a colony at that time. It is a bygone period that defines the victorious of the imperialists of that given era. As Stalin noted; "The redistribution of the world and spheres of influence, carried out as a result of the last imperialist war, has already managed to become "obsolete". Some new countries have come forward.. A furious struggle is going on for sales

markets, for markets for the export of capital, for sea and land roads to these markets, for a new redivision of the world… the growth of all these contradictions means the growth of the crisis of world capitalism, despite the fact of stabilization, a crisis incomparably deeper than the crisis before the last imperialist war… It is not surprising that imperialism is preparing for a new war, seeing in it the only way to resolve this crisis." (16)

Due to the law of uneven economic development new "imperialist" countries emerge against the old-victorious ones. "The law of uneven development in the period of imperialism" says Stalin, " means the spasmodic development of some countries in relation to others, the rapid ousting of some countries from the world market by others, the periodic redistribution of the already divided world in the order of military clashes and military catastrophes... the fact that the world has already been divided among imperialist groups, there are no more "free", unoccupied territories in the world, and in order to occupy new markets and sources of raw materials, in order to expand, one must take from others this territory by force… the unprecedented development of technology.. made it easier for some countries to leap ahead of others, for the more powerful countries to be ousted by less powerful but rapidly developing countries. the old distribution of spheres of influence between individual imperialist groups each time comes into conflict with the new alignment of forces on the world market… The world imperialist war was the first attempt to redistribute an already divided world. Needless to say, the first attempt at redistribution must be followed by a second attempt, for which preparatory work is already underway in the imperialist camp." (15)

Old imperialist countries already have their "military industry" and ready for a new war militarily. New ones are in the process of building their military industry and getting

ready for a new war. That' s why they choose the "appeasement policy" against the "old" as much as possible to do so. Here comes the question of "policy" that is repeated abstractly without answering the question of; what is the actual *(domestic and foreign)* policy that is being followed by each belligerent country before the war.?

Without studying this "policy" concretely, repeating the statement that "war is a continuation of policy in different form", "explains absolutely nothing."

Finishing up with Stalin's words;

> Many people think that imperialist pacifism is an instrument of peace. This is fundamentally wrong. Imperialist pacifism is an instrument for preparing for war and for covering up this preparation with Pharisaic phrases about peace. Without such pacifism...the preparation of wars under present conditions is impossible.
>
> There are naive people who think that if there is imperialist pacifism, then there will be no war. This is completely false. On the contrary, whoever wants to get the truth must reverse this situation and say: since imperialist pacifism …flourishes, there will certainly be new imperialist wars and interventions.

Svitlana M, Erdogan A

Notes and Related Articles to Read

(1) Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism

(2) Lenin, Introduction to "N.I. Bukharin: Imperialism and World Economy"

(3) N.I. Bukharin, Imperialism and World Economy

(4) Lenin, Address To The Second All-Russia Congress Of Communist Organisations Of The Peoples of The East

(5) Lenin, Lecture on the Proletariat, and War

(6) Lenin, The Social-Chauvinists' Sophisms

(7) Lenin, Junius Pamphlet

(8) Lenin, Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)

(9) Lenin, Report On Foreign Policy

(10) Lenin, Left-wing Communism

(11) Stalin, Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)

(12) Lenin, Under a False Flag

(13) Lenin, Speech At A Meeting In Butyrsky District

(14) Stalin, Economic Problems of the USSR, 1951

(15) Stalin, 7th Extended Plenary Session of the ICCI

(16) Stalin, Notes on modern topics

(17) Stalin, On the results of the July Plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks

From the book; Basic Economic Law of Monopoly Capitalism-Transition to Imperialism Transition to imperialism

Concentration of production and monopoly

Concentration and monopolies in banking

Financial capital and financial oligarchy

The export of capital

The economic division of the world

Completion of the territorial division of the world between the great powers and the struggle for its redistribution

Basic economic law of monopoly capitalism

The historical place of imperialism

Imperialism is parasitic or decaying capitalism

Imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution

State monopoly capitalism

The law of uneven economic and political development

The essence of the general crisis of capitalism

World War I and the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the split of the world into two systems

The crisis of the colonial system of imperialism

Aggravation of the problem of markets

Deepening crises of overproduction and changes in the capitalist cycle

Economic doctrines of the era of capitalism

Bourgeois classical political economy

The emergence of vulgar political economy

Petty-bourgeois political economy

Utopian socialists

Revolutionary democrats in Russia

Revolutionary upheaval in political economy

Modern bourgeois political economy

Economic theories of the opportunists of the Second International and contemporary right-wing socialist

On Anti-Imperialist Wars

Anti-Imperialist wars and dialectic connection to socialist revolutions

To a degree due to the lack of sufficient theoretical knowledge, yet largely consciously created confusion in the question of anti-imperialist wars, prevents some ML Revolutionaries to take the correct stand against imperialist aggression. Lack of sufficient knowledge commonly results in generalizing the assessments made for a specific case or condition to every case, to every condition as a slogan. Labeling ISIS and other proxies in Syria as "progressive", "freedom fighters against the "regime"!", "defining the war as an "Imperialist war" so the "defense of fatherland" does not apply" etc. are some of the current examples of this confusion - either consciously or not. All these bourgeois revisionist assessments and confusion derive from the laziness towards reading classics, the preference of learning by rote and phrase making rather than studying the subject and applying the dialectic of Marxism.

In reference to this type of laziness and phrase-making practice, Lenin said "The itch is a painful disease. And when people are seized by the itch of revolutionary phrase-making the mere sight of this disease causes intolerable suffering. ..Truths that are simple, clear, comprehensible, obvious, and apparently indisputable to all who belong to the working people are distorted by those suffering from the above mentioned kind of itch. Often this distortion arises from the best, the noblest and loftiest impulses, “merely” owing to a failure to digest well-known theoretical truths or a childishly crude, school-boyishly slavish repetition of them irrelevantly (people don’t know “what’s what”). But the itch does not cease to be harmful on that account" (1)

Taking Lenin's assessment on the stand against "imperialist wars" has been applied to all type of wars without making any assessment of the type of war in question. A stand without making a distinction between just and unjust, progressive, and reactionary, imperialist, and anti-imperialist wars inevitably lands an honest Marxist Leninist on the side of counter revolution.

The consciously created confusion by the bourgeois revisionists, counter revolutionary Trotskyites stems from, or directly related to their "conclusion!" that “in the epoch of imperialism, there can be no more national wars", so "the anti-imperialist wars are a thing of the past".

In reality, for Marxist Leninists, anti-imperialist wars are not only inevitable in our epoch and vitally important, but a significant part of the socialist revolution in particular and in general - for the defeat of capitalism in a given country and in world scale.

"The struggle against imperialism in general," says Enver Hoxha, " and its tools in every country is one of the fundamental questions of the strategy of every communist party, and one of the decisive conditions for the triumph of any revolution, whether people's democratic, anti-imperialist, or socialist. At the same time, its attitude to imperialism serves as a touchstone to evaluate the political and ideological position of every political force which operates either within the national framework of each country, or on an international scale. In other words, the stand towards imperialism has always been a line of demarcation which divides the genuine patriotic and democratic revolutionary forces, on the one hand, from the forces of reaction, counter-revolution and national betrayal, on the other hand." (2)

That is why it is crucial to understand the different type of wars, their assessment, and taking the right stand in order not to fall in the bourgeois revisionist trap, not to side with the imperialists and become a mouthpiece for them. Comprehending the importance of anti- imperialist wars is crucial because the stand to these wars defines the difference between revolution and counter revolution, Marxism Leninism and bourgeois revisionism, communism, and anti-communism. And because the success of Anti-imperialist wars could play important role in shortening the defeat of capitalism not only in any given country, but the defeat of capitalism in world scale.

We should start the study of the question from the most cited assessment of Lenin by which most of the confusion arises - and abused: "The Defeat of One's Own Government", "defense of the fatherland amounting to the defense of the right of one's own bourgeoisie ".

Defense of Father Land - What is an imperialist war?

> ""the imperialist war, which is a predatory war conducted in the interests of the capitalists" (3)

If not all, most who do not make any distinction between wars quote Lenin's following assessment to support their claim;

"From the point of view of the proletariat, recognizing "defense of the fatherland" means justifying the present war, admitting that it is legitimate. And since the war remains an imperialist war, irrespective of the country—mine or some other country—in which the enemy troops are stationed at the given moment, recognizing defense of the fatherland means, in fact, supporting the imperialist, predatory bourgeoisie, and completely betraying socialism. " (4)

And /or;

> "A proletarian cannot deal a class blow at his government or hold out (in fact) a hand to his brother, the proletarian of the "foreign" country which is at war with "our side", without committing "high treason", without contributing to the defeat, to the disintegration of his "own", imperialist "Great" Power. " (5)

However, none of those who make this "quote", pay any attention to the key words in the paragraph, namely; " the present war", " imperialist war". Lenin, at these quotes, is speaking of the ML stand against the imperialist, aggressive wars, not defensive wars.

On his lecture "The present war " says Lenin, " is an imperialist one, and that is its basic feature. An imperialist war is quite a different matter. Socialists who fail to realise that the present war is imperialist, who fail to take a historical view of it, will understand nothing about the war." (6)

Again in Socialist Conference at Kienthal, he says; " The present war—precisely because it is an imperialist war insofar as both groups of belligerent "great" powers .." (7)

And again at 2nd Socialist Conference, he says: The present war is an imperialist war, i.e., a war born of contradictions on the basis of highly developed, monopoly capitalism" (8)

It is so obvious and apparently indisputable fact that he was talking about imperialist wars - wars between imperialists.

He clarifies the question of "defense of fatherland" in his various critique and writings. "In the era of imperialism" , he says, "defense of the fatherland amounts to defense of the right of one's own bourgeoisie to oppress foreign peoples. This, however, is true only in respect of all imperialist war, i.e., in respect of a war between imperialist powers or groups of powers". And he continues; "The authors seem to present the

question of “defense of the fatherland” very differently from the way it is presented by our Party. We renounce “defense of the fatherland” in an imperialist war. This is said as clearly as it can be in the Manifesto of our Party’s Central Committee and in the Berne resolutions.....The authors of the.. theses seem to renounce defense of the fatherland in general, i.e., for a national war as well, believing, perhaps, that in the “era of imperialism” national wars are impossible. " (9)

He makes it clearer in his writing on Blancism;

> "The proletarian standpoint in this matter consists of a definite class characterization of war, and of an irreconcilable hostility to imperialist war—that is, to a war between groups of capitalist countries (no matter whether monarchies or republics) for a division of capitalist spoils." (10)

And concludes on his Reply to P. Kievsky

"Defense of the fatherland is a lie in an imperialist war, but not in a democratic and revolutionary war." (11)

In his letter to Zinoviev Lenin says " We are not at all against “defence of the fatherland” in general, not against “defensive wars” in general. You will never find that nonsense in a single resolution (or in any of my articles). We are against defence of the fatherland and a defensive position in the imperialist war of 1914–16 and in other imperialist wars, typical of the imperialist epoch. But in the imperialist epoch there may be also “just”, “defensive”, revolutionary wars [namely (1) national, (2) civil, (3) socialist and suchlike. " (12)

Excluding bourgeois revisionist, for any Marxist Leninist, these quotes should clarify without any doubt that Lenin was NOT generalizing the “defence of the fatherland” attitude towards

wars, but speaking only of the attitude towards "imperialist wars"

Anti-imperialist wars are a thing of the past? - Imperialist wars and anti-imperialist wars

For those who claim that “The era of national wars has passed," "it is a question of past”, Lenin, On Marxism and Proudhonism states otherwise. " Marx and Engels", he says, “did not live to see the period of imperialism. The system now is a handful of imperialist “Great” Powers, each oppressing other nations"...the main thing today is to stand against the united, aligned front of the imperialist powers, the imperialist bourgeoisie and the social-imperialists, and for the utilization of all national movements against imperialism for the purposes of the socialist revolution." (13)

In his work, Imperialism and Revolution, Enver Hoxha takes the subject with its importance in socialist revolution.

> "the linking and interlacing of the national-democratic, anti-imperialist, national liberation revolution with the socialist revolution, because, by striking at imperialism and reaction, which are common enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, these revolutions also pave the way for great social transformations, assist the victory of the socialist revolution. And vice-versa, by striking at the imperialist bourgeoisie, by destroying its economic and political positions, the socialist revolution creates favorable conditions for and facilitates the triumph of liberation movements.
>
> Therefore, when we draw the conclusion that the revolution is a question put forward for solution, that it is on the agenda, we have in mind not only the socialist revolution, but also the democratic anti-imperialist revolution." (14)

Similarly, in his writing “Our Understanding of the New Era” Lenin says; " We give a correct Marxist definition of the relation between the “era” and the “present war”: Marxism requires a concrete assessment of each separate war. " and continues; At the beginning of the article the concept “era of imperialism” is distorted to make it appear that the national movement has been consummated in general, and not only in the advanced Western countries." (15)

On his critique of Junius’ pamphlet, Lenin takes up the issue extensively. Citing the quotes from the pamphlet, Lenin writes;

> "The first of Junius’ erroneous postulates, the first is contained in the International group’s thesis No. 5:
>
> “In the epoch (era) of this unbridled imperialism, there can be no more national wars. National interests serve only as an instrument of deception, to deliver the masses of the toiling people into the service of their mortal enemy, imperialism....”
>
> This postulate is the end of thesis No. 5, the first part of which is devoted to the description of the present war as an imperialist war. The repudiation of national wars in general, may either be an oversight or a fortuitous over-emphasis of the perfectly correct idea that the present war is an imperialist war and not a national war. But as the opposite may be true, as various Social-Democrats mistakenly repudiate all national wars because the present war is falsely represented to be a national war, we are obliged to deal with this mistake.
>
> “there can be no more national wars” is that the world has been divided up among a handful of “Great” imperialist powers, and, therefore, every war, even if it starts as a national war, is transformed into an

imperialist war, and affects the interests of one of the imperialist Powers or coalitions. (16)

The fallacy of this argument is obvious. Of course, the fundamental proposition of Marxian dialectics is that all boundaries in nature and society are conventional and mobile, that there is not a single phenomenon which cannot under certain conditions be transformed into its opposite. A national war can be transformed into an imperialist war, and vice versa.

Only a sophist would deny that there is a difference between imperialist war and national war on the grounds that one can be transformed into the other.

National wars waged by colonial, and semi-colonial countries are not only possible but inevitable in the epoch of imperialism.... Every war is a continuation of politics by other means. The national liberation politics of the colonies will inevitably be continued by national wars of the colonies against imperialism.

National wars must not be regarded as impossible in the epoch of imperialism even in Europe. The “epoch of imperialism” made the present war an imperialist war; it inevitably engenders (until the advent of socialism) new imperialist war; it transformed the policies of the present Great Powers into thoroughly imperialist policies. But this “epoch” by no means precludes the possibility of national wars, waged, for example, by small (let us assume, annexed or nationally oppressed) states against the imperialist Powers, any more than it precludes the possibility of big national movements in Eastern Europe"" (16)

In "Military programme of the Proletarian Revolution" Lenin takes up the question again to clarify:

"In Section 5 of the Internationale group these we read: “National wars are no longer possible in the era of this unbridled imperialism.” That is obviously wrong.

Junius, who defends the above-quoted “theses” in her pamphlet, says that in the imperialist era every national war against an imperialist Great Power leads to intervention of a rival imperialist Great Power. Every national war is this turned into an imperialist war. But that argument is wrong, too.

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and tantamount to European chauvinism in practice: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., are invited to tell the oppressed peoples that it is “impossible” for them to wage war against “our” nations!

Thirdly, the victory of socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all wars in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars.

We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by words. The term “defense of the fatherland”, for instance, is hateful to many because both avowed opportunists and Kautskyites use it to cover up and gloss over the bourgeois lie about the present predatory war. This is a fact. But it does not follow that we must no longer see through to the meaning of political slogans. To accept “defense of the fatherland” in the present war is no more nor less than to accept it as a “just” war, a war in the interests of the proletariat—no more nor less, we repeat, because invasions may occur in any war. It would be sheer folly to repudiate “defense of the fatherland” on the part of oppressed nations in their wars against the imperialist Great Powers...

Theoretically, it would be absolutely wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of policy by other means. The present imperialist war is the continuation of the imperialist

policies of two groups of Great Powers, and these policies were engendered and fostered by the sum total of the relationships of the imperialist era. But this very era must also necessarily engender and foster policies of struggle against national oppression and of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie and, consequently, also the possibility and inevitability; first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second of proletarian wars and rebellions against the bourgeoisie; and third of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war, etc."" (17)

As we, unquestionably, understand from Lenin, the claims that the" National wars are no longer possible in the era of imperialism"," it is a question of past" etc. is wrong thus, anti-Marxist Leninist.

How do we differentiate the wars?

Defining the war Types -Distinction between Defensive and Aggressive Wars

When "the war becomes truly forced upon us, it becomes a truly just war of defense" . (18)

In his work, Socialism and War, Lenin points out the different approach and reasons for. He says;

> Socialists have always condemned war between nations as barbarous and brutal. But our attitude towards war is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the Anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the country; we understand that war cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and Socialism is created; and we also differ in that we fully regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by the

> oppressed class against the oppressing class, slaves against slave-owners, serfs against land-owners, and wage-workers against the bourgeoisie, as legitimate, progressive, and necessary.
>
> We Marxists differ from both the pacifists and the Anarchists in that we deem it necessary historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) to study each war separately. In history there have been numerous wars which, in spite of all the horrors, atrocities, distress and suffering that inevitably accompany all wars, were progressive, i.e., benefited the development of mankind by helping to destroy the exceptionally harmful and reactionary institutions (for example, autocracy or serfdom), the most barbarous despotism in Europe (Turkish and Russian). Therefore, it is necessary to examine the historically specific features of precisely the present war. " (19)

Lenin follows by saying that " a proletariat who tolerates the violence by its nation against other nations cannot be a socialist';

Imperialism is the epoch of the constantly increasing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of "great" powers and, therefore, it is impossible to fight for the socialist international revolution against imperialism unless the right of nations to self-determination is recognized. "No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations" (Marx and Engels). A proletariat that tolerates the slightest violence by "its" nation against other nations cannot be a socialist proletariat. " (19)

In his article "A caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", Lenin clearly explains the difference between defensive, aggressive, just unjust, reactionary, progressive

wars. He asks the question; "How, then, can we disclose and define the "substance" of a war? " And responds;

"War is the continuation of policy. Consequently, we must examine the policy pursued prior to the war, the policy that led to and brought about the war. If it was an imperialist policy, i.e., one designed to safeguard the interests of finance capital and rob and oppress colonies and foreign countries, then the war stemming from that policy is imperialist.

If it was a national liberation policy, i.e., one expressive of the mass movement against national oppression, then the war stemming from that policy is a war of national liberation.

The philistine does not realize that war is "the continuation of policy"

In short: a war between imperialist Great Powers, or in alliance with the Great Powers, is an imperialist war.

A war against imperialist nations is a genuine national war. .. "Defense of the fatherland" in a war waged by an oppressed nation against a foreign oppressor is not a deception. Socialists are not opposed to "defense of the fatherland" in such a war. "

To fall into negation of wars really waged for liberating nations is to present the worst possible caricature of Marxism. .....Rejection of "defense of the fatherland" in a democratic war, i.e., rejecting participation in such a war, is an absurdity that has nothing in common with Marxism." (20)

Lenin on Marxist Attitude towards War says; "socialists have regarded wars 'for the defense of the fatherland', or 'defensive' wars, as legitimate, progressive and just" only in the sense of "overthrowing alien oppression". It cites an example: Persia against Russia, "etc.", and says:

"These would be just, and defensive wars, irrespective of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent, and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory 'Great' Powers. " (20)

Stalin, in his work, The Foundation of Leninism summarizes Lenin's approach;

" Leninism proceeds from the following theses:" a) The world is divided into two camps: the camp of a handful of civilized nations, which possess finance capital and exploit the vast majority of the population of the globe; and the camp of the oppressed and exploited peoples in the colonies and dependent countries, which constitute that majority.

c) The revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples in the dependent and colonial countries against imperialism is the only road that leads to their emancipation from oppression and exploitation. " (21)

Defining the wars as imperialist wars - wars between the imperialist great powers- and as anti-imperialist wars - wars against imperialist oppression, exploitation, and aggression - at the same time defines the revolutionary stand and counter-revolutionary stand to any given war. Revisionists often try to justify the aggressive imperialist war and side with the imperialists, under the pretext that the "character of national movement" waging anti-imperialist war is "reactionary".

Stalin explains ML attitude and gives clarifying example with the underlying principled reason:

"The unquestionably revolutionary character of the vast majority of national movements is as relative and peculiar as is the possible reactionary character of certain particular national movements. The revolutionary character of a national movement under the conditions of imperialist oppression does

not necessarily presuppose the existence of proletarian elements in the movement, the existence of a revolutionary or a republican programme of the movement, the existence of a democratic basis of the movement. The struggle that the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchist views of the Emir and his associates, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism." (21)

Stalin goes further and says that a bourgeois national movement's bourgeois struggle against imperialism is a progressive, revolutionary struggle, while a struggle for "socialism" which is being waged on the side of imperialism is a reactionary struggle.

"For the same reasons, the struggle that the Egyptian merchants and bourgeois intellectuals are waging for the independence of Egypt is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the bourgeois origin and bourgeois title of the leaders of the Egyptian national movement, despite the fact that they are opposed to socialism;

whereas the struggle that the British "Labour" government is waging to preserve Egypt's dependent position is for the same reasons a reactionary struggle, despite the proletarian origin and the proletarian title of the members of that government, despite the fact that they are "for" socialism.

There is no need to mention the national movement in other, larger, colonial and dependent countries, such as India and China, every step of which along the road to liberation, even if it runs counter to the demands of formal democracy, is a steam-hammer blow at imperialism, i.e., is undoubtedly revolutionary step." (21)

Stalin explains the reason by quoting Lenin;

> Lenin was right in saying that the national movement of the oppressed countries should be appraised not from the point of view of formal democracy, but from the point of view of the actual results, as shown by the general balance sheet of the struggle against imperialism, that is to say, "not in isolation, but on a world scale." (21)

"An imperialist war" says Lenin, "does not cease to be imperialist when charlatans or phrase-mongers or petty-bourgeois philistines put forward sentimental “slogans”" ..The proletariat fights for the revolutionary overthrow of the imperialist bourgeoisie; the petty bourgeoisie fights for the reformist “improvement” of imperialism, for adaptation to it, while submitting to it." (4) As Marxists, "We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars over the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always considered it absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to disavow revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism." (22)

Explaining the importance of anti-imperialist struggles, " The dialectics of history " says Lenin, "are such that small nations, powerless as an independent factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the ferments, one of the bacilli, which help the real anti-imperialist force, the socialist proletariat, to make its appearance on the scene...We would be very poor revolutionaries if, in the proletariat’s great war of Liberation for socialism, we did not know how to utilize every popular movement against every single disaster imperialism brings in order to intensify and extend the crisis. " (23)

As Enver Hoxha puts it bluntly "the stand towards imperialism has always been a line of demarcation which divides the genuine patriotic and democratic revolutionary forces, on the one hand, from the forces of reaction, counter-revolution and national betrayal, on the other hand." (2)

The claims to justify and ratify the imperialist aggression - "in the epoch of imperialism, there can be no more national wars", so "the anti-imperialist wars are a thing of the past" and so the "defense of fatherland' is a bourgeois slogan" etc.- despite the prettified Marxist phrases used, are in fact bourgeois, counter revolutionary, and anticommunist claims.

As we have seen from the quotes of Lenin's writings, anti-imperialist wars are not only vitally important, but a significant part of the socialist revolution in particular and in general - for the defeat of capitalism in a given country, and for the defeat of capitalism in world scale.

Notes and Related articles to Read

(1) Lenin, The itch

(2) Enver Hoxha, The Euro-communists' "Independence" Is Dependence on Capital and the Bourgeoisie

(3) Lenin, Draft Resolution on the Present Political Situation – P41

(4) Lenin, The Proletarian Revolution and The Renegade Kautsky, What Is Internationalism? – P49

(5) Lenin, The Defeat of One's Own Government in the Imperialist War – P66

(6) Lenin, Lecture On "The Proletariat And The War" – P73

(7) Lenin, The 2nd International Socialist Conference at Kienthal – P80

(8) Lenin, Initial Variant of R.S.D.L.P. C.C. Proposals To The Second Socialist Conference – P92

(9) Lenin, For or Against Annexations? – P104

(10) Lenin, On Blancism, - P115

(11) Lenin, Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov) – P201

(12) Lenin, To: G. Y. Zinoviev – P119

(13) Lenin, Marxism or Proudhonism? - P122

(14) Enver Hoxha, The Peoples' Liberation Struggle - a Component Part of the World Revolution – P131

(15) Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, "Our Understanding of the New Era" – P133

(16) Lenin, The Junius Pamphlet, - P139

(17) Lenin, The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution –P156

(18) Lenin, The Tasks of the Revolution – P160

(19) Lenin, Socialism and War, The Attitude of Socialists Towards the War – P166

(20) Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, The Marxist Attitude Towards War and Defense Of fatherland – P167

(21) Stalin, The Foundation of Leninism – P175

(22) Lenin, Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers – P187

(23) Lenin The Irish Rebellion of 1916 – P195

On Imperialist Wars and Bolsheviks

It is important to note that the approach to the war in Ukraine is slowly but surely drawing the demarcation line between Marxism Leninism and Liberalism, between the idealist abstractionist and dialectic approach. Marxist "teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action, Marx and Engels always used to say, rightly ridiculing the learning and repetition by rote of 'formulas' which at best are only capable of outlining general tasks that are necessarily liable to be modified by the concrete economic and political conditions. It is essential to realize the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of real life, of the concrete realities, and must not continue to cling to a theory of yesterday."(1) Practice of applying general principles and rules as prescription formulas for the determination of the tactics and stands to be taken in a given situation is a betrayal to the sole of Marxism and its dialectics. “In politics, in which sometimes extremely complicated—national and international—relationships have to be dealt with, but it would be absurd to concoct a recipe, or general rule that would serve in all cases. One must have the brains to analyze the situation in each separate case.” (2) “Marxism requires of us a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relation of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation.” (3) “Relations of classes” is not limited to the relations between the competing monopoly-capitalist classes, but in their direct relation to the working classes.

The political aims of monopoly capitalists in their relations and conflicts will always have an effect in the life and struggle of the working class. “Concrete political aims must be set in concrete circumstances. All things are relative, all things flow, and all things change.” (4) The approach to each and every war cannot be based on the generalization of “wars” and prescriptive application of to all. To consider the matter

concretely does not mean to examine the “era “and apply the formula fits that “era”. To hold such a view “says Lenin, “is to reduce the whole thing to an absurdity and apply a ridiculous stereotype in place of a concrete analysis of each separate war.” (5)

“Marxist dialectical method forbids the employment of “ready-made schemes” and abstract formulas, The dialectical method demands, first, that we should consider things, not each by itself, but always in their interconnection with other things. (6) “Genuine dialectics,” Lenin wrote, proceeds “by means of a thorough, detailed analysis of a process in all its concreteness. The fundamental thesis of dialectics is: there is no such thing as abstract truth, truth is always concrete.” (7) Because the strategy, tactics and stands of Communists derive from the interests of the working class and of their struggle and are guided by Marx’s principle that “they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.” (8) In order not to err in policy, in order not to find itself in the position of idle dreamers, the party of the proletariat must not base its activities on abstract "principles of human reason," but on the concrete conditions of the material life of society.” (9)

“For a Marxist,” says Lenin,” clarifying the nature of the war is a necessary preliminary for deciding the question of his attitude to it. But for such a clarification it is essential, first and foremost, to establish the objective conditions and concrete circumstances of the war in question. It is necessary to consider the war in the historical environment in which it is taking place, only then can one determine one’s attitude to it. Otherwise, the resulting interpretation will be not materialist but eclectic.” Depending on the historical circumstances, the relationship of classes, etc., the attitude to war must be different at different times. (10)

“The character of a war and its success depend chiefly upon the internal regime of the country that goes to war, that war is a

reflection of the internal policy conducted by the given country before the war. "(11) Thus, war cannot be assessed without first understanding its connection with the policies preceding it, without a study of the policies pursued long before the war.

"The character of the social contradictions and the way in which they are resolved depend on economic relations" says Fyodorov and co-writers. "The economic system ultimately determines all social, political, and ideological relations, including also the conditions for the emergence of wars." (12)

"Capitalist society" says Bukharin, "is unthinkable without armaments, as it is unthinkable without wars…the rule of finance capital implies both imperialism and militarism. In this sense militarism is no less a typical historic phenomenon than finance capital itself… even where there are relatively equal economic structures, but the military powers of the state capitalist trusts differ considerably." (13)

That is true "the war is a continuation of politics" but throwing this generalization does not tell us the nature of "politics" that is being followed by each imperialist at each given time. Bourgeois ideologists and opportunists try hard to conceal the link between politics and war.

That is why the issue of "imperialism" and attitude to it cannot be studied independently from its political aspect- that is (militarization of industry and) war- in each given concrete condition and situation. Lenin was saying that "Abstract theoretical reasoning may lead to the conclusion at which Kautsky has arrived .. by abandoning Marxism. It goes without saying that there can be no concrete historical assessment of war, unless it is based on a thorough analysis of the nature of imperialism, both in its economic and political aspects." (14)

"Imperialism" by its general and economic "definition" is not decisive in every situation and condition to determine the

specific stand to be taken against. Without studying the political aspect, the "policy" concretely at any given situation, repeating the statement that "war is a continuation of policy in different form", "explains absolutely nothing."

Notes and related articles to Read

(1) Lenin-The Tasks of The Proletariat in Our Revolution

(2) Lenin, Left-wing Communism

(3) Lenin, Letters on Tactics

(4) Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution

(5) Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism

(6) Maurice Cornforth, Materialism, and the Dialectical Method

(7) Lenin, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back

(8) Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto

(9) History of Communist Party of The Soviet Union (B)

(10) Lenin, Lecture on the Proletariat, and the War"

(11) Lenin, Address To The Second All-Russia Congress Of Communist Organisations Of The Peoples of The East

(12) Fyodorov, Byely, Koztov, Marxism-Leninism on War and Army

(13) N.I. Bukharin, Imperialism and World Economy

(14)Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism

Extract from the introduction of Yakelova -P9

On Zimmerwald, The journal Kommunist – P16

Economic Causes and Consequences of the World War, E. Varga.- P20

The Attitude of The Russian Social Democratic Labor Party towards the war- P35

Lecture on “The proletariat and the War”, Lenin- P55

Resolution adopted at the Seventh International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart- P62

Manifesto of the International Socialist Congress at Basel- P66

Manifesto of Central Committee. ("Theses on War")- P73

Reply of the Central Committee to Vandervelde- P82

Greeting of the representative of the Central Committee at the Swedish S.-D. Congress.- P85

Declaration of the Central Committee of R. S.-D. R.P. presented to the London Conference – P88

Proposals Submitted by the CC of the R.S.D.L.P to the 2nd Socialist Conference, Maximovich -P91

The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International, Lenin – P101

International and the "defence of the fatherland", Lenin- P108

On the split with the opportunists, Lenin- P115

Several Theses, Lenin- P119

Zimmerwald Left, Draft manifesto submitted to the conference- P123

World War and the Tasks of Social Democracy, Draft resolution introduced by the left Zimmerwald- P127

Manifesto of the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald-P130

Two statements at Zimmerwald conference- P136

Draft resolution submitted by the Zimmerwald Left at the conference in Kienthal – P138

The Kienthal Manifesto- P142

Statement delivered at the Kienthal Conference- P148

The collapse of the Zimmerwald International- P149

Conferences, meetings about the attitude towards the war- P153

Okhrana on the First Bern Conference- P155

Resolutions of the conference of foreign sections of R. S.D. R.P- P156

Statements from groups: Moscow Committee, Russian S.-D. labor party, Tver group in Moscow, Presnenskaya group in Moscow, A group of organized Social-Democrats in Moscow, Moscow Group of S.-D, Saratov organization, Price of War, Baltic region, Chronicle of the Social Democrat, Kronstadt S.D, Ural S.D. about the war and the tasks of the Social-Democrats - P162

Party press attitude to the war- P189

Decade of the World War, Results of the war; prospects for new wars- P191

The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart (Proletary)- P208

War and Leninism, G. Zinoviev- P216

The main work of German opportunism on the war, Lenin- P225

British Pacifism and the British Dislike of Theory, Lenin- P231

Bellicose (aggressive) Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy, Lenin- P238

Report On Foreign Policy, Lenin- P250

A shame that nothing can atone for, Clara Zetkin-P272

After WW 1

On the international situation and foreign policy of the USSR, Molotov- P284

A Warmonger's International, Otto Kuusinen- P296

The war Danger at the Present Time, O.W. Kuusinen- P314

Interview with a "Pravda" Correspondent , Stalin- P318

The Question of Peace and Security, Stalin- P325

When is War Not Inevitable?, Stalin- P331

Notes on Contemporary Topics, Stalin- P333

Speech Delivered at the Fifth-Union Conference of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, Stalin- P372

Interview Between J. Stalin and Roy Howard- P374

Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), Stalin- P376

Answers to Associated Press Moscow Correspondent's Questions, Stalin- P387

The Allied Campaign in Africa Answers to Associated Press Moscow Correspondent, Stalin- P388

On the Allied Landing in Northern France, Stalin- P390

Stalin's address to the people- P391

Interview to “Pravda” Correspondent Concerning Mr. Winston Churchill’s Speech at Fulton, Stalin- P395

Concerning the Situation in Japan, Stalin- P401

Economic Problems of the USSR, Stalin- P403

From Falsificators of History- P408

ON BOYCOTT

Marxist theories have been turned into empty slogans, both unconsciously by Marxists, and consciously by imperialist ideologues through isolating it from the type of country, existing situation, and prevailing conditions. Through phrase-mongering, tactical theories presented as prescriptions fitting every country, every condition, every stage, and situations.
This practice has been one of the core reasons in the defeat and hindrance of revolutionary struggle.

" Our theory is a guide to action, not a dogma" says Marx and Engels. Marxism requires a concrete assessment of each specific situation and condition in order to take a tactical stand and action thereupon.

Marxists make decision on every tactical action from the point of the workers' class struggle interests, by carefully and objectively assessing the existing concrete conditions.

If we carefully read Lenin's writings, the first thing we notice is that the question of boycott - as well as parliamentary form of struggle- varies depending on the stage of revolutionary struggle. In " Left Wing Communism" he defines these periods as ; The years of preparation of the revolution (1903-05), The years of revolution (1905–07), The years of reaction (1907–10), The years of revival (1910–14), The First Imperialist World War (1914–17), The second revolution in Russia (February to October 1917).

Lenin defines "The years of preparation of the revolution (1903-05) as "the approach of a great storm is felt everywhere. All classes are in a state of ferment and preparation. ... The representatives of the three main classes of the three principal political trends, the liberal bourgeois, the petty bourgeois-democratic, and the proletarian-revolutionary trends, anticipate and prepare the approaching open class struggle by

a most bitter battle on programmatical and tactical views. All the issues on which the masses waged an armed struggle in 1905-07 and 1917-20 can (and should) be studied in their embryonic form in the press of that time..... the classes were forging the requisite political and ideological weapons for the impending battles."

We do not see any mention of Boycott at this stage.

He defines “The years of revolution” (1905–07) as; "All classes come out into the open. All programmatical and tactical views are tested by the action of the masses. The strike struggle is unparalleled anywhere in the world for its extent and acuteness. The economic strike grows into a political strike, and the latter into insurrection. ... The Soviet form of organization is born in the spontaneous development of the struggle. ... The alternation of parliamentary and non-parliamentary forms of struggle, of tactics of boycotting parliament and tactics of participating in parliament, of legal and illegal forms of struggle, and likewise their interrelations and connections -- all of this is distinguished by an astonishing richness of content..... "

And stresses the importance of this stage; "Without the "dress rehearsal" of 1905, the victory of the October Revolution in 1917 would have been impossible."

At this stage he states; "..it is clear that our tactics at present should first of all consist in support for the idea of a boycott. " However, contrary to the "far-left" arguments and isolationist approach from the social democrats (in countries like Turkey where the left wing democrats are in the ranks of opposition to autocracy), Lenin states; " The very question of a boycott lies within the bounds of bourgeois democracy.

The working class is not directly interested in it, but it is definitely interested in supporting that section of bourgeois

democracy which is more revolutionary; it is interested in extending and intensifying political agitation. A boycott of the Duma means a more vigorous appeal to the people by the bourgeoisie, a development of its agitation, a greater number of opportunities for our agitation, and a more intense political crisis, which is the source of the revolutionary movement." (1) Fundamental difference from the far-left, anarcho- Trotskyite call for boycott (none of which has any ties with the laboring masses) and thus a "passive Boycott", Lenin had in mind an active boycott. He states; " Our tactics with regard to the State Duma may be formulated in five points.... gaining the adherence for the promotion of this agitation and of the armed struggle of all revolutionary democratic elements, and of such elements only,.... support of the boycott idea, which arose among the Left-wing bourgeois democrats, with the purpose of making it an active boycott in the sense of the most widespread agitation ..."" (2)

In deciding for an active boycott, " We must consider two questions" says Lenin,"1) Is it possible to discuss, at election meetings,... "together with" the class struggle, socialism, and insurrection? 2) If that is possible, should the former and the latter questions be discussed together, or the latter in place of the former?" (3)

That's why, for example, in a country like Turkey where over %50 is voting for religious autocracy, and if not all but very close to % 100 of the population lay their hopes in parliament and parliamentary elections, to speak of an "active boycott", especially without the participation of left wing democrats, would be nothing but an illusion.

Lenin's assessment, later in the stage , at the start of 1906, in January, points to a major difference to above. He says; " The class background of this split is clear: the Right wing of the bourgeoisie is prone to come to terms with reaction through the

Duma. The Left wing of the bourgeoisie is prone to form an alliance with the revolution, or at any rate to back it." (4)

Together with the changing of conditions, the stand for boycott changes. In February he states: "We are continuing our struggle for a genuine assembly of real representatives of the people. That assembly must be elected freely, and by all alike, without any privileges for the landlords and the wealthy, and without any hindrance on the part of the authorities and the police. Only a freely elected constituent assembly of the whole people can be a genuine Duma and not a sham one. (5)

In March, he states; "in counter-posing revolutionary methods of struggle for freedom to the struggle through the Duma, to devote especial attention during this agitation to familiarizing the workers and the people as a whole with the experience of the December uprising, which marks the beginning of a higher stage of the revolutionary struggle for genuine freedom for the people" (6)

He clearly explains the boycott tactics' relation with the existing, changing conditions. He says; " Our readers know that we were in favour of boycotting the Duma. At the Congress we voted against the formation of a Social-Democratic parliamentary group, for reasons that were given in detail in the resolution published in Volna, No. 12. These reasons did not involve matters of principle; they were prompted by considerations of prudence and the practical conditions prevailing." (7)

In July, Lenin summarizes the object of boycott; "The object of the boycott was to sweep away the Witte Duma.. its direct and immediate object, the boycott nevertheless was indirectly of advantage in that, among other things, it distracted the attention of the government. In this case, too, as always, revolutionary tactics were the best means of developing the class consciousness and fighting efficiency of the proletariat,

and of indirectly ensuring the achievement of half-hearted reforms in the event of failure to achieve complete victory."

In August, he explains the approach to boycott; " It should be borne in mind that we have always presented this question concretely, and in connection with a definite political situation. ..The principal difference between revolutionary Social-Democracy and opportunist Social-Democracy on the question of boycott is as follows: the opportunists in all circumstances confine themselves to applying the stereotyped method copied from a specific period in the history of German socialism...The revolutionary Social-Democrats, on the contrary, lay chief emphasis on the necessity of carefully appraising the concrete political situation....it would be ridiculous to shut our eyes to realities. The time has now come when the revolutionary Social-Democrats must cease to be boycottists. We shall not refuse to go into the Second Duma when (or "if") it is convened. We shall not refuse to utilise this arena, but we shall not exaggerate its modest importance." (8)

And in November; " At the present time a boycott will not divert the forces of the government—the latter has certainly learned the lesson of the past elections. The work of agitation and organisation can be performed just as well by taking part in elections as by boycotting them—unless the electoral law is changed very much for the worse. If it is, then, perhaps, we may have to resort to the boycott again. But we may not have time to bother with Duma elections at all if big revolutionary battles begin again. Thus, boycotting remains a question of expediency. The only point is that for the time being we do not see sufficient grounds for a boycott. " (9)

As we see from the foregoing, even during the "Years of Revolution " approach to boycott was differed based on the objective prevailing conditions.

Lenin defines the years 1907-190 as the " Years of Reaction" where "Tsardom scored victory....The country's development along bourgeois lines proceeds with remarkable speed. Extra-class and above-class illusions, illusions concerning the possibility of avoiding capitalism, are scattered to the winds. The class struggle manifests itself in quite a new and more distinct form....Now they have to realize that this knowledge must be supplemented with the knowledge how to retreat properly. .. Of all the defeated opposition and revolutionary parties, the Bolsheviks effected the most orderly retreat, with the least loss to their "army," with its core best preserved, with the least splits, with the least demoralization, and in the best condition to resume the work on the broadest scale and in the most correct and energetic manner. The Bolsheviks achieved this only because they ruthlessly exposed and expelled the revolutionary phrase-mongers, who refused to understand that one had to retreat, that one had to know how to retreat, and that one had absolutely to learn how to work legally in the most reactionary parliaments, in the most reactionary trade unions, cooperative societies, insurance societies and similar organizations."

In reference to the question of boycott Lenin says ;" The case is presented in such a manner as if the ultra-reactionary nature of the Third Duma by itself makes such a method of struggle or such a slogan as the boycott necessary and legitimate. The impropriety of such an argument is absolutely clear to any Social- Democrat since there is no attempt here whatever to examine the historical conditions of the boycott's applicability. The Social-Democrat who takes a Marxist stand draws his conclusions about the boycott not from the degree of reactionariness of one or another institution, but from the existence of those special conditions of struggle that, as the experience of the Russian revolution has now shown, make it possible to apply the specific method known as boycott." (10)

In his letter to Maria he states: "I am against boycotting the Third Duma; I have been writing a little piece on this subject which will probably soon be out. In my opinion that slogan must not be revived unless there is a situation of heightened political activity, unless there is a struggle against early constitutional illusions....To declare a boycott at the moment would be either premature bravado or the uncritical repetition of slogans that have a glorious revolutionary past."

He clarifies the use of boycott as following:

> "active boycott, as the experience .. has shown, is correct tactics .. only under conditions of a sweeping, universal, and rapid upswing of the revolution, developing into an armed uprising, and only in connection with the ideological aims of the struggle
> against constitutional illusions arising from the convocation of the first representative assembly by the old regime;.....the tactics of boycott could be appropriate only provided our efforts to convert the trade-union upswing into a revolutionary assault were successful." (11)

Criticizing Maximov Lenin states; " In the political situation of June 1907, when Maximov advocated the boycott, the mistake was still quite a small one.....in July 1907, in this district almost all the Social-Democrats without exception were boycottists but, unlike Maximov, by June 1908 they had the sense to understand that it would be unpardonable stupidity to insist on "boycotting" the Third Duma. " (12)

"The attempts of ultimatumism to assert its direct connection with the tactics of boycott practiced by our wing of the Party during a particular stage of the revolution" says Lenin in criticizing Otzovism and ultimatumism, "merely distort the true meaning and character of the boycott of the Bulygin Duma and the First Duma, which was quite correctly applied by the

overwhelming majority of our Party. By their attempt to deduce, from the particular cases in which the boycott of representative institutions was applied at this or that moment of the revolution, that the policy of boycott is the distinguishing feature of Bolshevik tactics, even in a period of counter revolution, ultimatumism and otzovism demonstrate that these trends are in essence the reverse side of Menshevism, which preaches indiscriminate participation in all representative institutions, irrespective of the particular stage of development of the revolution, irrespective of whether a revolutionary upsurge exists or not." (13)

For those who learn from rote and lack the application of Marxist dialectics, they " only memorised a few slogans without grasping their meaning, could only repeat old phrases and were unable to adapt the old principles of revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics to the changed conditions." (14)

Lenin defines the years (1910–14) as "The years of revival"; "At first the rise was incredibly slow; then, following the Lena events of 1912, it became somewhat more rapid. .... But the Bolsheviks would never have succeeded in doing this had they not carried out a correct tactic of combining illegal work with the obligatory utilization of "legal possibilities." The Bolsheviks won all the labour seats in the arch-reactionary Duma."

His writings in regard to boycott is limited to the critique of Trotsky and his inflated phrases.

The First Imperialist World War era (1914–17) he states; "Legal parliamentarism, with an extremely reactionary "parliament," is of very useful service to the party of the revolutionary proletariat, the Bolsheviks.

The Bolshevik deputies are exiled to Siberia..... one of the principal reasons why Bolshevism was able to score victory in 1917-20 was that ever since the end of 1914 it had been

ruthlessly exposing the baseness, loathsomeness, and vileness of social-chauvinism and "Kautskyism" , and the masses later became more and more convinced by their own experience of the correctness of the Bolshevik views. "The Bolsheviks " he says "called for an active boycott of the Duma and concentrated their propaganda on the following slogans: armed uprising, revolutionary army, provisional revolutionary government. They used the boycott campaign to mobilize all the revolutionary forces, carry out mass political strikes and prepare an armed uprising. The nation-wide general political strike of October 1905 and the mounting wave of revolution prevented the elections and the Duma was never convened." (15)

In his letter to Inessa Armand he says that ""in general, refusal to participate in representative institutions is an absurdity; there are cases when we have to refuse; there is a visual comparison for you which makes clear that there is no contradiction between them. "(16)

For The second revolution in Russia (February to October 1917), where " within a few days Russia was transformed into a democratic bourgeois republic, more free -- under war conditions -- than any other country in the world. The leaders of the opposition and revolutionary parties began to set up a government", there was no case of boycott. His writings are mostly related to the evaluation of previous boycott tactics. In one of those writings he asks the question ; " Why did the tactics of boycotting the Third Duma prove incorrect?" and responds, " Because they were based only on the "catchiness" of the boycott slogan... .The objective situation, however, was such that on the one hand the revolution was in a state of collapse and declining fast....extra-parliamentary means of propaganda, agitation and organisation were almost nonexistent or extremely weak." (17)

He repeats the same conclusion on another writing ; " The boycott of the "Duma" by the Bolsheviks in 1906 was, however, a mistake, although a small and easily remediable one. A boycott of the Duma in 1907, 1908 and subsequent years would have been a serious mistake and one difficult to remedy." (18)

As we see, except the year of revolution, boycott was not effective and proved to be wrong. Stalin notes; " By boycott, the Bolsheviks usually meant an active boycott, and not the mere passive abstention from voting in the elections," and quotes Lenin; "The boycott was unable to frustrate the convocation of the Duma because, as subsequently became clear, it took place at a time when the revolution was receding, when it was on the decline."

Stalin on his reply to the Letter of the Political Secretariat of ECCI dated 25th October, 1933 states; The Cominternists are not correct. The boycott proposed by them is not an active boycott in the Bolshevik spirit. It is a simple abstention from elections: simply absenteeism. The Bolsheviks have never observed such a boycott. They observe only active boycott accompanied by revolutionary activities, their aim is to undermine or even to foil the elections. But this, the solely acceptable boycott, is now not possible in Germany. Therefore the Cominternists are wrong and the Foreign Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPG is correct. You must participate in the elections, cross out the fascist list and vote for the option 'no' in the referendum. On such a basis you must form an anti-fascist front with the social-democratic workers and lead them so that such an initiative can be undertaken on a communist platform and under their leadership. Any other politics will serve only the interests of the fascists and social-democrats.

Another example from Stalin is "On the tactics of Greek Communist Party Stalin stressed the fact that the Greek communists earlier made an error with the boycott of the parliamentary elections , he states "Boycotting makes sense

when it brings about the failure of elections. Otherwise, a boycott is a foolish thing."" Dimitrov's Diary , September 2, 1946

Treating the tactic of boycott as a practice that fits to every country, every situation regardless of the objective conditions and the balance of power, especially in fascist, autocratic countries can only further isolate the revolutionaries from the masses and thus serves the interests of the reactionary bourgeois. Boycott is a tactic at a given right time in order to mobilize all the revolutionary forces, carry out mass political strikes and prepare an armed uprising. If this situation and conditions do not exist, as Stalin puts it, a boycott is a foolish thing."

Notes and Related Articles to Read

The years of revolution (1905–07)

(1) The Boycott of the Bulygin Duma and insurrection Page 23

(2) In the wake of monarchist bourgeoisie or Page 36

(3) Playing at Parliamentarism Page 55

(4) The State Duma and Social-Democratic Tactics Page 131

(5) To All Working Men and Women of the City of St. Petersburg and Vicinity Page 146

(6) Resolution of the St. Petersburg Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P. on the Tactics of Boycott Page 158

(7) The Social-Democratic Election Victory in Tiflis Page 185

(8) The Boycott Page 199

(9)How History is Written Page 212

(10) Against Boycott Page 304

(11) Attitude of the Social-Democratic Labour Party to the Third Duma Page 356

(12) The faction of supporters of Otzovism and God-building Page 391

(13) On Otzovism and Ultimatumism Page 443

(14) The Liquidation of Liquidationism Page 461

(15) Should We Participate in Bourgeois Parliaments? Page 552

(16) To: Inessa Armand

(17) From a publicist's diary Page 538

(18)"Left-Wing" Communism, an infantile disorder Page 548

The years of revival (1910–14) Page 475

The Zemstvo Congress Page 90

To M.A Reisner Page 100

The landlords on the boycott of the Duma Page 102

A Replete Bourgeoisie and a craving bourgeoisie Page 107

The first result of the political alignment Page 118

The St. Petersburg City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (II) Page 152

What Was the Objective Significance of Our Participation in the Duma Elections? Page 166

Kautsky on the State Duma Page 180

Unsound Arguments of the "Non-Party" Boycotter Page 189

Among Newspapers and Periodicals Page 197

Draft Election Address Page 218

The Attitude of the Bourgeois Parties and of the Workers' Party to the Duma Elections Page 226

The Dissolution of the Duma and the Tasks of the Proletariat

The crisis of Menshevism Page 265

The years of reaction (1907–10)

Lenin and Krupskaya to Maria Page 355

The Social-Democrats and the Duma Elections Page 359

The Fifth Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party Page 371

The historical meaning of the inner party struggle in Russia

Fundamental Problems of the Election Campaign Page 481

The Sixth All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. Page 524

The First Imperialist World War (1914–17)

The Marxist Attitude Towards War and "Defense of the Fatherland Page 532

The second revolution in Russia (February 1917)

Theses for a Report at the October 8 Conference of the

Petrograd Organisation Page 535

Kommunismus - Journal of the Communist International

Letter to Austrian Communists August 1920 Page 573

STALIN

Dispersion of the First State Duma. Page 578

The state Duma and the tactics of Social democracy Page 593

The elections in St Petersburg Page603

On Bureaucracy

"an apparatus for policy (=reviewing and correcting relations between classes), and not a policy for the apparatus!

(A good) bureaucracy in the service of policy, and not a policy in the service of (a good) bureaucracy." Lenin (1)

As in most terms used in order to confuse the minds and throw dirt on the Soviets and the Stalin, the term bureaucracy has been used for the same purpose. Bourgeois liberals, right opportunists used the term in its bourgeois context borrowed from and in aligned with the Trotskyites distortion, left opportunists used it in its anarchistic, anarcho-Trotskyites context. It is not surprising that both right and left opportunist borrow from Trotskyites, for Trotskyism is the mixture of both.

Being two sides of the same coin, in essence, both sides are the enemy of socialism with "socialist` mask." An old and often repeated objection to socialism" says Lenin," is that socialism means "barracks for the masses" and "mass bureaucracy"". (2)

Bureaucracy, as Marx takes up Hegel's definition; "executive is nothing but the administration, which he develops as the bureaucracy... The official function is the duty and the life's work of the civil servants… indeed, the bureaucracy is merely the formalism of a content which lies outside the bureaucracy itself… The bureaucracy is the state formalism of civil society…The bureaucrats are the Jesuits and theologians of the state… The aims of the state are transformed into aims of bureaus, or the aims of bureaus into the aims of the state. The bureaucracy is a circle from which no one can escape. Its hierarchy is a hierarchy of knowledge…. The abolition of the bureaucracy can consist only in the universal interest becoming really particular interest; and this is possible only through the particular interest really becoming universal." (3)

Lenin defines as "the civil service, the bureaucracy, as representing a special category of persons who specialise in the work of administration and occupy a privileged position as compared with the people. We see this institution everywhere, from autocratic and semi-Asiatic Russia to cultured. free and civilised England, as an essential organ of bourgeois society." (4)

Bureaucracy - officialdom, Bureaucrats – administrators has a history goes back to old monarchy, feudal systems. Explaining the first appearance and its class base, Lenin says that " the bureaucracy was the first political instrument of the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords, and against the representatives of the "old-nobility" system in general, and marked the first appearance in the arena of political rule of people who were not high-born landowners, but commoners, "middle class" and from the very conditions of the formation and recruitment of this class, which is open only to bourgeois "offspring of the people," and is connected with that bourgeoisie by thousands of strong ties. …. every bureaucracy, by its historical origin, its contemporary source, and its purpose, is purely and exclusively a bourgeois institution" (5)

Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism, the bureaucracy remains an administrative arm of the ruling class as Lenin puts it; "in a capitalist state which is centralized, not by the arbitrary will of the bureaucracy, but by the inexorable demands of economic development, that organisation must find expression in a single force welded together throughout the state." (6)

As Engels gives a particular example "where the bourgeoisie was, politically, far less educated, the Liberal bureaucracy walked into office, and professed to hold power in trust for them. We have further seen, how the parties and classes of society, that were heretofore all united in opposition to the old government, got divided among themselves after the victory,

or even during the struggle; and how that same Liberal bourgeoisie that alone profited from the victory turned round immediately upon its allies of yesterday, assumed a hostile attitude against every class or party of a more advanced character, and concluded an alliance with the conquered feudal and bureaucratic interests."(7)

Marx giving another example "under Napoleon, the bureaucracy was only the means of preparing the class rule of the bourgeoisie. Under the Restoration, under Louis Philippe, under the parliamentary republic, it was the instrument of the ruling class." (8)

Although bureaucracy obtains its motives from the bourgeoisie, but its action is with a tendency and a form that is purely and solely feudal". Lenin explains this as following;

> "Only people who have never given a thought to the new brought by the first decade of the twentieth century, who understand nothing about the interdependence between the economic and the political relations….But it is not enough to concede that the connection exists, it is necessary to point out what exactly is the actual nature of this connection. The step taken toward the transformation into something new by no means eliminates the old, say, "bureaucratic" regime with its vast self-sufficiency and independence, with its "peculiar nature" .., and with its uncontrolled finances…..While it "obtains the motives for its activity" largely from the upper ranks of the bourgeoisie the bureaucracy lends its bourgeois activity a tendency and a form that is purely and solely feudal.` (9)

Anarchist utopia that expects the building of socialism in the morning of revolution and withering away of state in the following days, expects the self-administration of the masses –

meaning the elimination of bureaucracy – officialdom. What is destroyed with the bourgeois state is the bourgeois bureaucracy. As Stalin explains; "with the abolition of the old apparatus of state administration, bureaucracy was smashed, but the bureaucrats remained." (10)

Lenin's words "Do not defend but rectify the bureaucratic excesses. The fight against bureaucracy is a long and arduous one" tells more in one sentence than a thousand page academic book with terms only the writer can understand.

Since the transformation into something new by no means eliminated the old" in all aspects, and especially the old bureaucrats remained and the class struggle against the bourgeois remnant continues, the other question is related to combining this struggle with the struggle against bourgeois bureaucrats. As Lenin puts it;

> "control over the capitalists is impossible if it remains bureaucratic, for the bureaucracy is itself bound to and interwoven with the bourgeoisie by thousands of threads. " (11)

And thus;

> "it is clear that the old executive apparatus, the bureaucracy, which is connected with the bourgeoisie, would simply be unfit to carry out the orders of the proletarian state." (12)

As Stalin puts it bluntly and sincerely;

> "our state apparatus, which is bureaucratic to a considerable degree, exerts a certain amount of pressure on the Party and the Party workers. In 1917, when we were forging ahead, towards October, we imagined that we would have a Commune, a free association of working people, that we would put an end to

> bureaucracy in government institutions, and that it would be possible, if not in the immediate period, then within two or three short periods, to transform the state into a free association of working people. Practice has shown, however, that this is still an ideal which is a long way off, that to rid the state of the elements of bureaucracy, to transform Soviet society into a free association of working people, the people must have a high level of culture, peace conditions must be fully guaranteed all around us so as to remove the necessity of maintaining a large standing army, which entails heavy expenditure and cumbersome administrative departments, the very existence of which leaves its impress upon all the other state institutions. Our state apparatus is bureaucratic to a considerable degree, and it will remain so for a long time to come" (13)

This confirms Marx's and Lenin's assessment that "the transformation into something new by no means eliminates the old" in all aspects overnight. Like the bureaucracy from feudal society remained and changed in context after the bourgeois revolution, some of the "old", like "state" and "bureaucracy" will remain in different class context and form till the transition to communist society in its scientific meaning -at its higher stage. Lenin puts this fact bluntly by saying that "The economic foundations for the withering away of the state": in this case we also have the "economic foundations" for the withering away of bureaucracy," (9)

Stalin, repeating marks and Lenin puts the question and solution at the fifteenth congress;

> "The Party' s task is to continue along the line of isolating the new bourgeoisie and to strengthen the bond between the working class and the working Soviet intelligentsia in town and country.

> d) The state apparatus and the struggle against bureaucracy. So much is being said about bureaucracy that there is no need to dilate on it. That elements of bureaucracy exist in our state, co-operative and Party apparatus, there can be no doubt. That it is necessary to combat the elements of bureaucracy, and that this task will confront us all the time, as long as we have state power, as long as the state exists, is also a fact."(14)

The question is not only a question of state – from top down, but of masses -bottom up. As Stalin states," It will be impossible to reform the state apparatus, to alter it thoroughly, to expel elements of bureaucracy and corruption from it and to make it near and dear to the broad masses unless the masses themselves render the state apparatus constant and active assistance. But on the other hand, active and continuous assistance of the masses is impossible unless the best elements of the workers and peasants are drawn into the organs of government, unless direct and close connection is established between the state apparatus and the "rank and file" of the toiling masses." (15)

Only the opportunist kinship of right and left use the terms in its bourgeois meaning and context disregarding the fundamental differences after "the transformation to the new "and "the struggle waged, precautions and steps taken in preparation of the foundation for its withering away.

What is purposely overlooked and never mentioned is that unlike in bourgeois society, in socialist society - the bureaucrats - all officials and every kind of all deputies are not only elected by the workers, but displaceable by them at any moment. The salaries of bureaucrats do not exceed that of a competent worker.

“Officials” says Lenin “appointed” from above to “direct” the local population have always been a sure step towards the restoration… What the people need is a really democratic, workers’ and peasants’ republic, whose authorities have been elected by the people and are displaceable by the people any time they may wish it.”(16)

In general, as Marx asks the question “What is the "social question" as understood by the civil servant?” and responds; “It is the maintenance of his salary and his present position, which is superior to the people… ambitious professors, lawyers and similar persons, who can only hope to obtain respectable posts in a state where betrayal of the people's interests to the government is a lucrative business.” *(17)*

As Engels well explains for the capitalist society “The bureaucracy is beginning more and more to despise embezzlement as the sole means of improving its income; it is turning its back on the state and beginning to hunt after the far more lucrative posts on the administration of industrial enterprises.” *(18)*

“Tendency to become bureaucrats, i.e., privileged persons divorced from the people and standing above the people.” Says Lenin, “That is the essence of bureaucracy; and until the capitalists have been expropriated and the bourgeoisie overthrown, even proletarian functionaries will inevitably be “bureaucratized” to a certain extent.” (19)

In socialism where there is no industrial private enterprises and “embezzlement “is a risky business, Lenin states;

> “the bureaucracy, are either similarly replaced by the direct rule of the people themselves or at least placed under special control; they not only become elected officials, but are also subject to recall at the people’s first demand; they are reduced to the position of simple

> agents; from a privileged group holding "jobs" remunerated on a high, bourgeois scale, they become workers of a special "arm of the service", whose remuneration does not exceed the ordinary pay of a competent worker." *(20)*

Thus, as opposed to the bourgeois context and class character of bureaucracy in where they were a class or strata, in socialist society where they are workers of a special "arm of the service", the question is related to the approach and practice of "bureaucrats" in their "administrative" work in general and continuing struggle against the capitalist remnants , including the intelligentsia in particular. As Lenin puts it:

> "It is clear, I think, that the cries about this celebrated bureaucracy are just a screen for dissatisfaction with the personal composition of the central bodies, a fig-leaf to cover up the violation of a pledge solemnly given at the Congress. You are a bureaucrat because you were appointed by the Congress not in accordance with my wishes, but against them; you are a formalist because you take your stand on the formal decisions of the Congress, and not on my consent; you are acting in a grossly mechanical way because you cite the "mechanical" majority at the Party Congress and pay no heed to my wish to be co-opted; you are an autocrat because you refuse to hand over the power to the old snug little band who insist on their circle "continuity" all the more because they do not like the explicit disapproval of this circle spirit by the Congress.
>
> These cries about bureaucracy have never had any real meaning except the one I have indicated.
>
> They talk of bureaucracy. The word bureaucracy might be translated into Russian as concentration on place and

> position. Bureaucracy means subordinating the interests of the work to the interests of one's own career; it means focusing attention on places and ignoring the work itself; it means wrangling over co-optation instead of fighting for ideas. That bureaucracy of this kind is undesirable and detrimental to the Party is unquestionably true," *(21)*

"The characteristic feature of the present period" says Stalin, " is the intensification of the struggle between the capitalist countries and our country, on the one hand, and between the socialist elements and the capitalist elements within our country, on the other." *(22)*

And explains further;

> "The wrecking activities of the bourgeois intelligentsia are one of the most dangerous forms of resistance to developing socialism. ….what does the resistance offered by the capitalist elements of town and country to the socialist offensive represent? It represents a regrouping of the forces of the class enemies of the proletariat for the purpose of defending the old against the new. It is not difficult to understand that these circumstances cannot but lead to an intensification of the class struggle. But if we are to break the resistance of the class enemies and clear the way for the advance of socialism, we must, besides everything else, give a sharp edge to all our organisations, purge them of bureaucracy, improve their cadres and mobilize the vast masses of the working class and labouring strata of the countryside against the capitalist elements of town and country." (23)

Aside from the continuing class struggle, "The chief defect of these institutions "says Lenin "is that they are overburdened

with trivial matters. As a result, they are floundering in bureaucracy instead of fighting it. "Lenin, To: A. D. Tsyurupa

İt is clear that the question of "bureaucracy" during the phase of proletarian dictatorship-socialism has nothing to do with its bourgeois contexts but with the continuing class struggle and with the means and methods of -such as application of socialist ethics and norms, complains, criticism, self-criticism- preventing its hindering functions and preparation for its withering away. One striking example Lenin criticize;

> "We must not delude ourselves with lies. That is harmful. It is the main source of our bureaucracy…failure to study practical experience. This is the root of all evil, and the root of bureaucracy." (24)

And Stalin for self-criticism;

> "We cannot do without self-criticism. We simply cannot...Without it, stagnation, corruption of the apparatus, growth of bureaucracy, sapping of the creative initiative of the working class, are inevitable. Of course, self-criticism provides material for our enemies. You are quite right about that. But it also provides material (and a stimulus) for our advancement, for unleashing the constructive energies of the working people, for the development of emulation, for shock brigades, and so on. The negative aspect is counterbalanced and outweighed by the positive aspect.
>
> "It is possible that our press gives too much prominence to our shortcomings, and sometimes even (involuntarily) advertises them. That is possible and even probable. And, of course, it is bad. You demand, therefore, that our shortcomings should be counterbalanced (I would say: outweighed) by our

> achievements. You are, of course, right about that too. We shall most certainly repair this defect, and without delay. You need have no doubt of that." (25)

On the hindrance of bureaucracy in the industrial development Stalin says;

> "what is required to make the policy of reducing industrial production costs and wholesale prices of commodities possible and quite practicable? For that it is essential to have a radical improvement of the technology of production, a radical improvement of the organisation of labour in the factories, a radical improvement and simplification of the entire economic apparatus and a determined fight against bureaucracy in this apparatus." (26)

Analyzing the concept of Bureaucracy within the party organizations Lenin says;

> "Perhaps the only attempt to analyse the concept bureaucracy is the distinction drawn in the new Iskra (No. 53) between the "formal democratic principle" and the "formal bureaucratic principle". This distinction contains a grain of truth. Bureaucracy versus democracy is in fact centralism versus autonomism; it is the organisational principle of revolutionary Social-Democracy as opposed to the organisational principle of opportunist Social-Democracy. The latter strives to proceed from the bottom upward, and, therefore, wherever possible and as far as possible, upholds autonomism and "democracy", carried (by the overzealous) to the point of anarchism. The former strives to proceed from the top downward and upholds an extension of the rights and powers of the centre in relation to the parts. In the period of disunity and

> separate circles, this top from which revolutionary Social-Democracy strove to proceed organizationally was inevitably one of the circles, the one enjoying most influence by virtue of its activity and its revolutionary consistency…. Thus you have, in a different environment, the same struggle between the opportunist and the revolutionary wing of the Party on the question of organisation, the same conflict between autonomism and centralism, between democracy and "bureaucracy", between the tendency to relax and the tendency to tighten organisation and discipline, between the mentality of the unstable intellectual and that of the staunch proletarian, between intellectualist individualism and proletarian solidarity… attempts to analyse and precisely define this detestable "bureaucracy" inevitably lead to autonomism; attempts to "lend profundity" to their stand and vindicate it inevitably lead to justifying backwardness, to tail-ism.." *(21)*

Stalin takes the question of bureaucracy and struggle against it very seriously. "If it were only a question of the old bureaucrats" he says, "the fight against bureaucracy would be very easy. The trouble is that it is not a matter of the old bureaucrats. It is a matter of the new bureaucrats, bureaucrats who sympathise with the Soviet Government, and finally, communist bureaucrats. The communist bureaucrat is the most dangerous type of bureaucrat. Why? Because he masks his bureaucracy with the title of Party member." (27)

However, Stalin shows that he neither hides the facts of bureaucracy nor is he a utopian. He does not just point the question but points the solution. "Lenin's slogan about the cultural revolution.' He says, "The surest remedy for bureaucracy is raising the cultural level of the workers and

peasants. One can curse and denounce bureaucracy in the state apparatus, one can stigmatize and pillory bureaucracy in our practical work, but unless the masses of the workers reach a certain level of culture, which will create the possibility, the desire, the ability to control the state apparatus from below, by the masses of the workers themselves, bureaucracy will continue to exist in spite of everything." (14)

In this respect for the initiated. bureau named "Complaints Bureau" Stalin says;

> The work of the Complaints Bureaus is of tremendous importance in the struggle to remove shortcomings in our Party, Soviet, economic, trade-union and Komsomol apparatuses, in improving our administrative apparatus.
>
> Lenin said that without an apparatus we should have perished long ago, and that without a systematic, stubborn struggle to improve the apparatus we should certainly perish. This means that resolute and systematic struggle against conservatism, bureaucracy and red tape in our apparatus is an essential task of the Party, the working class and all the working people of our country.
>
> The tremendous importance of the Complaints Bureaus consists in their being a serious means of carrying out Lenin's behest concerning the struggle to improve the apparatus. "*(28)*

In conclusion, aside from few criticism and self-criticism writings on the question, most writings are bourgeois and revisionist, anarchist, anti-Marxists writings banking on the ignorance and lack of historical, theorical knowledge of the masses. Or at best utopian, anarchist writings by those who believes that after the political revolution, society will be

transformed into the communist society overnight. In the proletarian state representative organs are real working institutions, built and acting as "...a working body, executive and legislative at the same time."

And "between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (3)

"The political system of "socialist self-administration" has not only nothing in common with the dictatorship of the proletariat but is even opposed to it." (29)

As preparing the economic foundations for the withering away of the state is a precondition so is the "economic foundations for the withering away of bureaucracy." (9)

Anarchist, revisionist cries over (most commonly Stalinist') "bureaucracy" historically anti-Marxist disguised with insidious right and/or left deviations. As Stalin notes at his 13th Conference speech;

> "Trotsky affirms that groups arise because of the bureaucratic regime instituted by the Central Committee, and that if there were no bureaucratic regime, there would be no groups either. This is an un-Marxist approach, comrades. Groups arise, and will continue to arise, because we have in our country the most diverse forms of economy—from embryonic forms of socialism down to medievalism. That in the first place. Then we have the NEP, that is, we have allowed capitalism, the revival of private capital and the revival of the ideas that go with it, and these ideas are penetrating into the Party. That in the second place. And, in the third place, our Party is made up of three

> component parts: there are workers, peasants and intellectuals in its ranks. These then, if we approach the question in a Marxist way, are the causes why certain elements are drawn from the Party for the formation of groups, which in some cases we must remove by surgical action, and in others dissolve by ideological means, through discussion." (27)

In almost all cases the outcry against bureaucracy by either left or right opportunists end up supporting and defending the bureaucracy in different form. Enver Hoxha, in his "Memoirs from my Meetings with Stalin" writes;

> "The enemies of communism, ranging from international bourgeois reaction down to the Khrushchevites and all the other revisionists, have striven with every means to blacken and distort all the virtues, pure thoughts and just actions of this great Marxist-Leninist, and to discredit the first socialist state set up by Lenin and Stalin. With great cunning the Khrushchevites, these new disciples of Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Tukhachevsky, incited conceit and the feeling of superiority in those who had taken part in the war. They encouraged privileges for the élite, opened the way to bureaucracy and 'liberalism in the party and the state, violated the true revolutionary norms, and gradually managed to implant the defeatist spirit among the people." (30)

Marxist Leninists are not utopians to believe that bureaucracy will wither away overnight by force. They do take the necessary steps to fight against it and prepare the conditions for its withering away. One of the first which is , as Lenin puts it, bureaucrats "are reduced to the position of simple agents; from a privileged group holding "jobs" remunerated on a high, bourgeois scale, they become workers of a special "arm of the

service", whose remuneration does not exceed the ordinary pay of a competent worker."

One cannot and should not take the question of "bureaucracy" in the same manner, same context, within the same basket as they take in a capitalist country.

Notes and related articles to Read

(1) Lenin, Notes for a Speech at the 10th Congress

(2) Lenin, The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)

(3) Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right - P22

(4) Lenin, The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats – P51

(5) Lenin, The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of it in Mr. Struve's Book

(6) Lenin, The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907

(7) Engels, Revolution and Counter-revolution in Germany – P39

(8) Karl Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. - P41

(9) Lenin, Plan Of The Pamphlet, The Tax In Kind

(10) Stalin, Speech at the Opening of the, First All-Russian Conference of Responsible Personnel of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, October 15, 1920

(11) Lenin, The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It

(12) Lenin, State and Revolution Housing Question

(13) Stalin, From; The Party's Tasks – P85

(14) Stalin, The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) – P146

(15) Stalin, From; Questions and Answers – P112

(16) Lenin, What the Counter-Revolutionary Steps of the Provisional Gov

(17) Karl Marx, in Neue Rheinische Zeitung - P31

(18) Frederick Engels, The Housing Question – P50

(19) Lenin, From State and Revolution – P74

(20) Lenin, The Dual Power, Collected Works, Volume 24,

(21) Lenin, From; One Step Forward, Two Steps Back – P53

(22) Stalin, The Opposition Bloc in the C.P.S.U.(B.) - P128

(23) Stalin, From; The Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.) – P118

(24) Lenin, To Comrade Molotov For The Members Of The Political Bureau, 16 March, 1922, Collected Works, Volume 33, pages 237-242

(25) Stalin, Letter to A. M. Gorky, January 17, 1930

(26) Stalin, Speech Delivered at the Eighth Congress of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League - P151

(27) Stalin, Thirteenth Conference of the R.C.P.(B) – P95

(28) Stalin, The Importance & Tasks of the Complaints-Bureaus-P191

(29) Enver Hoxha, Yugoslav "Self-Administration" – P223

(30) Enver Hoxha, Memoirs from my Meetings with Stalin

Karl Marx, The Civil War in France – P43

Engels, The Prussian Military Question, and the German Workers' Party – P44

Marx and Engels, “Stirner” Delighted in His Construction – P48

Lenin, Old and New – P60

Lenin, Controversial Issues – P65

Lenin, To: The All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions -P78

Lenin, From; The Party Crisis – P79

Lenin, To: G. Y. Sokolnikov – P81

Lenin, From; To: A. D. Tsyurupa – P83

Stalin, From; Three years of Proletarian Dictatorship – P85

Stalin, From; The Discussion, Rafail, the Articles by

Preobrazhensky and Sapronov, and Trotsky’s Letter – P88

Stalin, The Results of the 13th Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) - P106

Stalin, The Fourteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) -P109

Stalin, Reply to the Discussion on the Report on “The

Social-Democratic Deviation in our Party” – P114

Stalin, Against Vulgarizing the Slogan of Self-Criticism - P156

Stalin, Letter to the Members of the Party Affairs Study Circle at the Communist Academy – P167

Stalin, The Right Danger in the C.P.S.U.(B.) – P170

Stalin, From; Political Report of the CC to the 16th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) – P186

Stalin, From; Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress on the

Work of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.) – P193

Kollontai, The Workers Opposition, On Bureaucracy – P205

On Compromise

As for most of the questions of Marxism Leninism, there always have been approaches to the question of compromise disregarding to dialectical connection and the totality of the subject as a whole. Each group, both right and left, rather than basing the approach to the theory, preferred eclecticism fitting their subjectivity and tendency.

The "Right" embraces compromise as principle regardless of the existing conditions, without responding to the questions; "compromise with whom, for what purposes, under what conditions." The Rights' tendency to reformism is the class collaboration through compromise in principle.

The "Left" with the subjective intentions of portraying themselves as the 'genuine revolutionaries", could never think of retreating or any tactical compromise forced by the circumstances, and thus cannot distinguish between policy of reformist compromise and tactical compromise, and rejects all compromise as "unprincipled".

Blind rejection of compromise "on principle" regardless of the circumstances is due to the failure of the most elementary fact of the revolutionary struggle: revolutionary struggle does not follow a straight line, it will have ups and downs till the victory, Marxist Leninists, based on the concrete assessment of any given conditions, should determine when to retreat in an orderly fashion with minimal possible loss, and when to compromise and when to advance.

In reality, opposition to any form of compromise of the "Left deviation" , at the final analyses is an isolation from the masses, sometimes in the form of anarchism and thus, the complete compromise of the working class movement to the bourgeoisie.

In this sense, both "left" and "right" constitute the different sides of the same coin. The revisionist kinship so to speak.

It is important to quote Stalin here;

> "I think that the proletariat, as a class, can be divided into three strata.
>
> One stratum is the main mass of the proletariat, its core, its permanent part, the mass of 'pure-blooded' proletarians, who have long broken off connection with the capitalist class. This stratum of the proletariat is the most reliable bulwark of Marxism.
>
> The second stratum consists of newcomers from the non-proletarian classes – from the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, or the intelligentsia. These are former members of other classes who have only recently merged with the proletariat and have brought with them into the working class their customs, their habits, their waverings and their vacillations. This stratum constitutes the most favourable soil for all sorts of anarchist, semi-anarchist and 'ultra-Left' groups.
>
> The third stratum, lastly, consists of the labour aristocracy, the upper stratum of the working class, the most well-to-do portion of the proletariat, with its propensity for compromise with the bourgeoisie, its predominant inclination to adapt itself to the powers that be, and its anxiety to 'get on in life'. This stratum constitutes the most favourable soil for outright reformists and opportunists.
>
> Notwithstanding their superficial differences, these last two strata of the working class constitute a more or less common nutritive medium for opportunism in general – open opportunism when the sentiments of the labour

> aristocracy gain the upper hand, and opportunism camouflaged with 'Left' phrases, when the sentiments of the semi-middle-class strata of the working class which have not yet completely broken, with the petty bourgeois environment gain the upper hand. The fact that 'ultra-Left' sentiments very often coincide with the sentiments of open opportunism is not at all surprising. Lenin said time and again that the 'ultra-Left' opposition is the reverse side of the Right-wing, Menshevik, openly opportunist opposition. " (1)

Reading one or two writings of Lenin on a subject and handpicking what fits the subjectivity, is a common tendency of each deviation. Lenin clearly states that

> "to reject compromises "on principle", to reject the permissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to consider seriously." (2)

Lenin stressing the crux of the matter says;

> " It is also incorrect to reduce the question to a bare repudiation of compromise ..it is ridiculous to absolutely reject compromises that are imposed by life itself…what matters a clear understanding and persistent pursuit of the aims of the struggle under all circumstances is." (3)

Lenin mentions the "left deviations'" revolutionary phrase making on the subject, states;

> "solemn" condemnation of "confusionism", and even of "all compromise"—this is an empty revolutionary phrase, because one cannot be opposed to all compromise), and, alongside of this, evasive, equivocal repetition of general phrases—phrases which do not

> explain the concept "dictatorship of the proletariat" but obscure it" (4)

And for the "right "deviation;

> "whoever exalts this negative task to something positive, is bound to slide into the role of a bourgeois advocate of compromise between people's freedom and the autocracy." (5)

Lenin quotes Engel's views on compromise;

> "Compromises are often unavoidably forced upon a fighting party by circumstances....The task of a truly revolutionary party is not to declare that it is impossible to renounce all compromises, but to be able, through all compromises, when they are unavoidable, to remain true to its principles, to its class, o its revolutionary purpose...." (6).

Based on the conditions and the existence or nonexistence of the revolutionary situation, "Compromise "says Lenin, "is an attempt on the part of the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers to get their needs satisfied by means of reforms, by concessions on the part of capital, without a socialist revolution." *(7)*

Explaining, setting the aim and the duty of revolution he says; "But it is impossible to give the people peace and land without overthrowing the bourgeoisie, without socialism. It is the duty of the revolution to put an end to compromise, and to put an end to compromise means taking the path of socialist revolution." *(7)*

Lenin explains the attitude of Marxism towards compromise in his article "Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist" ;

> "Marxism's attitude towards the zigzag path of history is essentially the same as its attitude towards compromise. Every zigzag turn in history is a compromise, a compromise between the old, which is no longer strong enough to completely negate the new, and the new, which is not yet strong enough to completely overthrow the old. Marxism does not altogether reject compromises. Marxism considers it necessary to make use of them, but that does not in the least prevent Marxism, as a living and operating historical force, from fighting energetically against compromises. Not to understand this seeming contradiction is not to know the rudiments of Marxism.
>
> Engels once expressed the Marxist attitude to compromises very vividly, clearly, and concisely in an article on the manifesto of the Blanquist fugitives of the Commune (1874). These Blanquists wrote in their manifesto that they accepted no compromises whatever. Engels ridiculed this manifesto. It was not, he said, a question of rejecting compromises to which circumstances condemn us (or to which circumstances compel us—I must beg the reader's pardon for being obliged to quote from memory, as I am unable to check with the original text). It was a question of clearly realizing the true revolutionary aims of the proletariat and of being able to pursue them through all and every circumstances, zigzags, and compromises." (8)

The compromises and concessions of the Bolsheviks, their assent to resolutions which in many respects were not forceful enough, were necessary for a clear-cut demarcation based on principle. "The subordination of the minority to the majority, not compromise with intellectualist groups' says Lenin, "only

this can serve as the principle of the working-class movement." (9)

In reference to the attitude towards compromise when there is a revolutionary situation Lenin says; "The slogan "All Power to the Soviets" is nothing but a call for insurrection. And the blame will be wholly and undoubtedly ours, if we, who for months have been calling upon the people to revolt and repudiate compromise, fail to lead them to revolt on the eve of the revolution's collapse, after the people have expressed their confidence in us." (10)

In reference to the general statement of German Revolutionaries;

> "all compromise with other parties, all reversion to parliamentary forms of struggle which have become historically and politically obsolete, and any policy of maneuvering and compromise must be emphatically rejected." "Specifically, proletarian methods of revolutionary struggle must be strongly emphasised."

Lenin says;

> "Any Bolshevik who has consciously participated in the development of Bolshevism since 1903 or has closely observed that development will at once say, after reading these arguments, "What old and familiar rubbish! What 'Left-wing' childishness!" (Lenin, P265)
>
> "We had to go into the Second Duma, we had to reckon with compromise once the circumstances forced it upon us against our will, despite our efforts, and at the cost of the defeat of our struggle." (11)

Marxist Leninists always determine their attitude based on the concrete assessment of any given situation without leaving the real ground. Proceeding from that principle, it is impossible to

reject or embrace "compromise" totally without betraying Marxism Leninism.

Compromise is a negative task forced upon the Marxist Leninist party or organization by circumstances at any given time especially when there is no objective and/or subjective conditions of revolution lacking. That is why, in Lenin's words "to reject compromises "on principle", to reject the permissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to consider seriously." And in Engels words It is not a question of rejecting compromises to which circumstances condemn us, it is a question of clearly realizing the true revolutionary aims of the proletariat and of being able to pursue them through all and every circumstances, zigzags, and compromises."

What differentiates the Marxist Leninists from the "revisionist kinship" of right and left is, the principle that, determination of attitude at any given time should always be based on the existing conditions and the interests of the working class and their struggle in mind without any compromise on theory and maximum goal.

Notes and related articles of Lenin

(1) Stalin, The Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

(2) Lenin, The Struggle Against Which Enemies Within the Working class, 1920 – P246

(3) Lenin, The Landlords on the Boycott of the Duma, 1905 – P51

(4) Lenin, A Publicist's Notes, February, 1920,

(5) Lenin, A New Upswing, May 6, 1906,

(6) Lenin, On Compromises, 1917 – P177

(7) Lenin, Speech On The Agrarian Question, 1917 – P206

(8) Lenin, Against Boycott, Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist

(9) Lenin, The Political Significance of Vituperation, June 24, 1914

(10) Lenin, Letter to the Bolshevik Comrades, October 1917

(11) Lenin, Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist

The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats, 1897 – P12

To G. V. Plekhanov, 1902 – P14

Political Sophisms, 1905 – P16

The Zemstvo Congress, 1905 – P17

Friends Meet, 1905 – P25

Revolutionary Office Routine & Revolutionary Action, 1905 - P26

In the Wake of the Monarchist Bourgeoisie, or In the Van of the

Revolutionary Proletariat and Peasantry? 1905 – P28

Realists Praise the Social-Democratic "Realists" For? 1905 – P42

The Victory of the Cadets & the Tasks of the Workers' Party, 1906– P55

The Social-Democrats and Electoral Agreements, 1906 – P87

Wavering Above, Determination Below, 1906 – P90

The St. Petersburg Elections & the Crisis of Opportunism, 1907 – P94

Revolution and Counter-Revolution, 1907 – P99

The Significance of the December (1908) Resolutions, 1910 – P100

The Cadets on Two Camps & 'Sensible Compromise', 1911 – P101

A Liberal Labour Party Manifesto, 1911 – P107

Plan for a Lecture "Manifesto of the Liberal Labour Party", 1911 – P112

From the Camp of the Stolypin "Labour" Party, 1911 – P114

Report of the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P. to the Brussels Conference,1914 – P121

To: A. G. Shlyapnikov, 1916 – P 159

The Chkheidze Faction and Its Role, 1916 - P161

The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), 1917 – P166

A Question of Principle, 1917 – P167

Resolution of the Central Committee of R.S.D.L.P, 1917 – P171

A Class Shift, 1917 – P174

Lessons of the Revolution, 1917 – P185

Heroes of Fraud & the Mistakes of the Bolsheviks, 1917 – P203

Meeting of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) 1917 – P204

On The Economic Condition Of Petrograd Workers And The

Tasks Of The Working Class, 1917 - P209

A Letter to Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) 1917 – P212

Speech on The Dissolution of The Constituent Assembly, 1918 –P214

Speech in The Moscow Soviet of Workers', Peasants' And Red

Army Deputies, 1918 – P218

Six Theses on The Immediate Tasks Of The Soviet Government, 1918 – P219

Speech At A Meeting In Butyrsky District, 1918 – P223

Draft Decree On The Dissolution Of The Constituent Assembly, 1918 – P224

The Proletarian Revolution & the Renegade Kautsky, 1918 – P227

No Compromises? 1920 – P229

On Compromises, 1920 – P243

"Left-Wing" Communism in Great Britain, 1920 – P256

"Left-Wing" Communism in Germany, 1920 – P265

Letter To G. K. Orjonikidze, 1921 – P267

Speech At The Opening Of The Congress, 1921 – P268

The Tax in Kind, 1921 – P270

Speech In Defense Of The Tactics Of The Communist

International, 1921 – P314

ON DEMOCRATIC STRUGGLE DEMOCRATIC TASKS OF SOCIALISTS

> "Can a class-conscious worker forget the democratic struggle for the sake of the socialist struggle, or forget the latter for the sake of the former? No, a class-conscious worker calls himself a Social-Democrat for the reason that he understands the relation between the two struggles. He knows that there is no other road to socialism save the road through democracy, through political liberty. " (1)

One of the most striking examples of the kinship between the right and left opportunism -reinforcing each other-, shows itself on the question of " democratic struggle ", "democratic tasks" of Marxist Leninists.

In colonial, semi colonial or dependent countries in general, and in countries where capitalism developed due to unequal laws of economy such as in Turkey particular, the understanding of democratic struggle, either consciously or unconsciously, presents itself in two forms; one is the Right deviation which takes democratic struggle as the base and spread the illusion that the Republic as the ultimate goal, the other is the left deviation which ignores the concrete facts, conditions and situation and rejects the democratic struggle exclusively under the pretext that it is " bourgeois tailgating " and spreads the illusion that the socialist revolution is on the agenda.

As Lenin explains;

> To the Marxist the problem is simply to avoid either of two extremes: on the one hand, not to fall into the error of those who say that, from the standpoint of the proletariat, we are in no way concerned with any immediate and temporary non-proletarian tasks, and

on the other, not to allow the proletariat's co-operation in the attainment of the immediate democratic tasks to dim its class-consciousness and its class distinctiveness." (2)

For Marxist Leninists democratic and socialist tasks and struggle for both are dialectically connected, not isolated from each other. One cannot be achieved independently from the other. Lenin clearly explains the meaning of both and their dialectical interconnection;

> "The object of the practical activities of the Social-Democrats is, as is well known, to lead the class struggle of the proletariat and to organise that struggle in both its manifestations: socialist (the fight against the capitalist class aimed at destroying the class system and organizing socialist society), and democratic (the fight against absolutism aimed at winning political liberty and democratizing the political and social system). We said as is well known. And indeed, from the very moment they appeared as a separate social-revolutionary trend, the Russian Social-Democrats have always quite definitely indicated this object of their activities, have always emphasized the dual manifestation and content of the class struggle of the proletariat and have always insisted on the inseparable connection between their socialist and democratic tasks—a connection clearly expressed in the name they have adopted.
>
> Simultaneously with the dissemination of scientific socialism, Russian Social-Democrats set themselves the task of propagating democratic ideas among the working class masses; they strive to spread an understanding of absolutism in all its manifestations, of its class content, of the necessity to overthrow it, of the

> impossibility of waging a successful struggle for the workers' cause without achieving political liberty and the democratization of Russia's political and social system.
>
> .. every resolute and consistent democratic demand of the proletariat always and everywhere in the world causes the bourgeoisie to recoil.. " (3)

This connection is especially much more important in countries where feudalism and semi-feudalism reigns. In regard to these types of countries, "the principal task of the proletariat at present " says Lenin "is to win the broadest freedom and bring about the most complete destruction of landlord (feudal) landed proprietorship. Only by doing this, only by completely smashing the old, semi-feudal society through democratic action, can the proletariat rise to full stature as an independent class, lay full emphasis on its specific (i.e., socialist) tasks, as distinct from the democratic tasks common to "all the oppressed", and secure for itself the most favourable conditions for an unrestricted, sweeping, and intensified struggle for socialism. If the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement stops half-way, if it is not carried through, the proletariat will have to spend a great deal more of its forces on general democratic (i.e., bourgeois-democratic) tasks than on its own class, proletarian, i.e., socialist, tasks. " (4)

Lenin speaking of undeveloped countries states;

> "The undeveloped countries are a different matter. They embrace the whole of Eastern Europe and all the colonies and semi-colonies .... In those areas, as a rule, there still exist oppressed and capitalistically undeveloped nations. Objectively, these nations still have general national tasks to accomplish, namely, democratic tasks, the tasks of overthrowing foreign

> oppression. While the proletariat of the advanced countries is overthrowing the bourgeoisie and repelling its attempts at counter-revolution, the undeveloped and oppressed nations do not just wait, do not cease to exist, do not disappear. ...
>
> The social revolution can come only in the form of an epoch in which are combined civil war by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries and a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movement, in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations." *Lenin (5)*

Related to the democratic revolution, emphasizing the importance of democratic struggle in these types of countries, Lenin states;

> "the more incomplete and irresolute this revolution, the longer and the more heavily will general democratic tasks, and not socialist, not purely class, proletarian tasks, weigh upon the proletariat. The more complete the victory of the peasantry, the sooner will the proletariat stand out as a distinct class, and the more clearly will it put forward its purely socialist tasks and aims. " (P6)

Stalin summarizes the essence of democratic struggle in these types of countries;

> " Today we are demanding a democratic republic. Can we say that a democratic republic is good in all respects, or bad in all respects? No, we cannot! Why? Because a democratic republic is good only in one respect: when it destroys the feudal system; but it is bad in another respect: when it strengthens the bourgeois system. Hence, we say: in so far as the democratic republic

> destroys the feudal system it is good -- and we fight for it; but in so far as it strengthens the bourgeois system it is bad -- and we fight against it. "" (7)

Marxist Leninist does not forget the democratic struggle for the sake of the socialist struggle or forget the socialist struggle for the sake of democratic struggle. However, always subordinates the democratic struggle to the struggle for socialism. As Lenin points out in " Marxism and Proudhonism on the national Question;

> "In contrast to the petty-bourgeois democrats, Marx regarded every democratic demand without exception not as an absolute, but as an historical expression of the struggle of the masses of the people, led by the bourgeoisie, against feudalism. There is not one of these demands which could not serve and has not served, under certain circumstances, as an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie for deceiving the workers. ..In practice, the proletariat can retain its independence only by subordinating its struggle for all democratic demands, not excluding the demand for a republic, to its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie."

In his critique of Kautskyites, he stresses the fact that only the socialists wage sincere democratic struggle in connection with the socialist Struggle;

> ""you are opposed to democratic demands," the Kautskyites argue, in the hope that inattentive people will not notice that this objection substitutes non-existent bourgeois-democratic tasks for the existing socialist tasks."
>
> Oh no, gentlemen, we reply to the Kautskyites. We are in favour of democratic demands, we alone fight for

> them sincerely, for the objective historical situation prevents us from advancing them except in connection with the socialist revolution." (8)

"The Commune " says Lenin, "was a splendid example of the unanimity with which the proletariat was able to accomplish the democratic tasks which the bourgeoisie could only proclaim." Lessons of the Commune " Let the liberals give democracy away for a few pennies and throw away the whole for the sake of banal and feeble, paltry dreams of doles." Socialists "must rouse among the people consciousness of integral democratic tasks and imbue the proletariat with a clear understanding of revolutionary aims. We must enlighten the minds of the masses of workers and develop their readiness to struggle, not befog their minds by toning down contradictions, by toning down the aims of the struggle." (9)

For Socialists " Instead of speaking about the "full" utilization of "broad" liberty (as a matter of fact, this is just vague phrase-mongering, which could very well be replaced, and should be, by definite reference to a democratic republic and a democratic constitution, for "full" utilization means consistent democracy)— instead of this, it was imperative to state that it is not only the working class that is interested in political liberty. Silence on this score is tantamount to opening the door wide to the worst forms of "economism," and to forgetting our general democratic tasks. *Lenin, (10)*

Lenin explains his statement " it was imperative to state that it is not only the working class that is interested in political liberty";

> "Why are the conditions for the democratic struggle not the same as those for the socialist struggle? Because the workers will certainly have different allies in each of those two struggles. The democratic struggle is waged

> by the workers together with a section of the bourgeoisie, especially the petty bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the socialist struggle is waged by the workers against the whole of the bourgeoisie. The struggle against the bureaucrat and the landlord can and must be waged together with all the peasants, even the well-to-do and the middle peasants. On the other hand, it is only together with the rural proletariat that the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and therefore against the well-to-do peasants too, can be properly waged." (1)

In contrast to the Permanent revolution theory of counter revolution which disregards and ignores any intermediate stages, processes, and impatiently leaps to the last stage in a Utopian, abstract way, Marxist- Leninist theory of Uninterrupted revolution takes in to account the constant changes in the social content of the revolution; constantly changing relations between the classes, constant changes in development in one stage to other. Revolution passes through a serious of stages. At these stages' proletariat has different allies. Democratic struggle in particular will have various allies depending on the given situation and concrete conditions.

Stalin with his skill in clarifying the subject sheds light to the question;

> "does not mean, of course, that since capitalism is decaying the socialist system can be established any time we like. Only Anarchists and other petty-bourgeois ideologists think that. The socialist ideal is not the ideal of all classes. It is the ideal only of the proletariat; not all classes are directly interested in its fulfillment the proletariat alone is so interested. This means that as long as the proletariat constitutes a small section of society the establishment of the socialist system is impossible.

The decay of the old form of production, the further concentration of capitalist production, and the proletarianization of the majority in society -- such are the conditions needed for the achievement of socialism. But this is still not enough. The majority in society may already be proletarianized, but socialism may still not be achievable. This is because, in addition to all this, the achievement of socialism calls for class consciousness, the unity of the proletariat and the ability of the proletariat to manage its own affairs. In order that all this may be acquired, what is called political freedom is needed, i.e., freedom of speech, press, strikes and association, in short, freedom to wage the class struggle.

But political freedom is not equally ensured everywhere. Therefore, the conditions under which it is obliged to wage the struggle: under a feudal autocracy (Russia), a constitutional monarchy (Germany), a big bourgeois republic (France), or under a democratic republic (which Russian Social-Democracy is demanding), are not a matter of indifference to the proletariat. Political freedom is best and most fully ensured in a democratic republic, that is, of course, in so far as it can be ensured under capitalism at all. Therefore, all advocates of proletarian socialism necessarily strive for the establishment of a democratic republic as the best "bridge" to socialism

That is why, under present conditions, the Marxist programme is divided into two parts: the maximum programme, the goal of which is socialism, and the minimum programme, the object of which is to lay the road to socialism through a democratic republic." (7)

Lenin, reiterates the words of Engels to emphasize the dialectic connection between theory and the assessment of existing condition for related practice;

> " Marxism requires of us a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relations of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation. We Bolsheviks have always tried to meet this requirement, which is absolutely essential for giving a scientific foundation to policy. " (11)

Left and right deviation kinship have always found their justification in eclecticism, in far-left phrase making, memorized slogans that has nothing to do with the concrete condition and situations. Either the petty bourgeois impatiens that Engels identifies as childishly naive "“What childish innocence it is to present one’s own impatience as a theoretically convincing argument!”!" (12) or the petty bourgeois tactics to escape from the struggles of day to day and immediate questions. " Marx and Engels always said, rightly ridiculing the mere memorizing and repetition of "formulas", that at best are capable only of marking out general tasks, which are necessarily modifiable by the concrete economic and political conditions of each particular period of the historical process. “(11)

The statements on the part of deviations to escape from the democratic struggle, have become a habitual routine losing its random nature same way the rejection and belittling of the democratic struggle to bond with the masses have become a habit. As Engels notes;

> "...‘We are Communists’ [the Blanquist Communards wrote in their manifesto], ‘because we want to attain our goal without stopping at intermediate stations, without

any compromises, which only postpone the day of victory and prolong the period of slavery.'" " (12)

Due to their impatience and/or escape from the struggle, regardless of the concrete situation, the abstract slogans such as "revolution now", "either all or nothing" despite its catchy sounding, does not serve the interests of working class and its struggle - unless the revolutionary situation exists. For a " Marxist must take cognizance of real life, of the true facts of reality. ' "" ... " A Marxist must not abandon the ground of careful analysis of class relations." (11)

Lenin states that the " general failure of the representatives of old revolutionary theories to understand the principles of Social-Democracy, accustomed as they are to base their programmes and plans of activity on abstract ideas and not on an exact appraisal of the actual classes operating in the country, classes that have been placed in certain relationships by history.""(13)

Criticizing the far-left with abstract approach and slogans, "German communists," says Engels, " are Communists because, through all the intermediate stations and all compromises created, not by them but by the course of historical development, ... The thirty-three Blanquists are Communists just because they imagine that, merely because they want to skip the intermediate stations and compromises, the matter is settled, and if 'it begins' in the next few days—which they take for granted—and they take over power, 'communism will be introduced' the day after tomorrow. If that is not immediately possible, they are not Communists. "(12)

On the absurdity of learning Marxism from rote and sloganization of phrases, Lenin was saying;

" It would be absurd to formulate a recipe or general rule ("No compromises!") to suit all cases. One must use

> one's own brains and be able to find one's bearings in each particular instance." (12)

Every democratic struggle duration may have "special situations" within, responses to which should be made based on the concrete assessment of the current special situation and determined the form of struggle and the tactical alliance for it. Lenin continues the previous quote;

> "It is, in fact, one of the functions of a party organisation and of party leaders worthy of the name, to acquire, through the prolonged, persistent, variegated and comprehensive efforts of all thinking representatives of a given class, the knowledge, experience and—in addition to knowledge and experience—the political flair necessary for the speedy and correct solution of complex political problems " (12)

For those opportunists who rejects any tactical alliance for the purpose of any given democratic struggle on the agenda, again, with far-left sounding pretexts like "supporting bourgeoisie", "tailgating Bourgeoisie" and choosing to do nothing and thereby, serving the interests of bourgeoisie indeed, Lenin states following;

> " it is our bounden duty to explain to the proletariat every liberal and democratic protest, to widen and support it, with the active participation of the workers, be it a conflict between the Zemstvo and the Ministry of the Interior, between the nobility and the police régime of the Orthodox Church, between statisticians and the bureaucrats, between peasants and the "Zemstvo" officials, between religious sects and the rural police, etc., etc. Those who contemptuously turn up their noses at the slight importance of some of these conflicts, or at the "hopelessness" of the attempts to fan them into a

> general conflagration, do not realize that all-sided political agitation is a focus in which the vital interests of political education of the proletariat coincide with the vital interests of social development as a whole, of the entire people, that is, of all its democratic elements. It is our direct duty to concern ourselves with every liberal question, to determine our Social-Democratic attitude towards it, to help the proletariat to take an active part in its solution and to accomplish the solution in its own, proletarian way. Those who refrain from concerning themselves in this way (whatever their intentions) in actuality leave the liberals in command, place in their hands the political education of the workers and concede the hegemony in the political struggle to elements which, in the final analysis, are leaders of bourgeois democracy. " (14)

Some of the" urgent task " arise due to specific conditions requires the revolutionaries "" to have the task of approaching to various layers of population" , this task " should not be limited with the " intellectual layer " (13)

What we have seen in the example of Turkey, for example, is the tragic irony where rather than supporting and trying to gain the leadership of the spreading broad masses of opposition and spontaneous opposition movement to fascist power, they prefer an alliance with the variations of Trotskyism who has no base in masses.

If we consider the specific case (religious-fascist dictatorship) and urgent task, the revolutionaries have to meet the needs of " awaking proletariat, to organize them, and strengthen the ties with the revolutionary groups and wage a struggle in order to integrate the " democratic tasks with the socialist tasks.

Distrust to the masses in essence derives from the distrust to herself, her own theory and practice capacity. Thus, the choice would be either individual practice isolated from the masses or similar movements, even counter-revolutionary "intellectual" groups. "However, " says Lenin, "the working class does not stand alone; at its side are all the political opposition elements, strata and classes, since they are hostile to absolutism and are fighting it in one form or another. Here side by side with the proletariat stand the opposition elements of the bourgeoisie, or of the educated classes, or of the petty bourgeoisie, or of the nationalities, religions, and sects, etc., etc., persecuted by the autocratic government. The question naturally arises of what the attitude of the working class towards these elements should be." (13)

It is unavoidable for the left and right deviations response to the question of "what the attitude of the working class towards these elements should be". Even though the response would look contradictory to each, in fact, in the final analyses, their approach would both be mutually supporting, reinforcing each other in the service of bourgeoisie. That is the nature of revisionism. Against the reformist outlook a " far - left outlook that turns its back to the democratic struggle with the claim of being pure socialist - that escapes from the struggle. Quote from Lenin below is quite important in understanding the subject;

> "particularly in regard to the political struggle that the “class point of view” demands that the proletariat give an impetus to every democratic movement. The political demands of working-class democracy do not differ in principle from those of bourgeois democracy, they differ only in degree. In the struggle for economic emancipation, for the socialist revolution, the proletariat stands on a basis different in principle and it stands alone... In the struggle for political liberation,

> however, we have many allies, towards whom we must not remain indifferent. But while our allies in the bourgeois-democratic camp, in struggling for liberal reforms, will always glance back and seek to adjust matters so that they will be able, as before, "to eat well, sleep peace fully, and live merrily" at other people's expense, the proletariat will march forward to the end, without looking back. While the confreres of R. N. S... haggle with the government over the rights of the authoritative Zemstvo, or over a constitution, we will struggle for the democratic republic. We will not forget, however, that if we want to push someone forward, we must continuously keep our hands on that someone's shoulders. The party of the proletariat must learn to catch every liberal just at the moment when he is prepared to move forward an inch and make him move forward a yard. If he is obdurate, we will go forward without him and over him." 14)

In Turkey, for example, the current " chief enemy " is autocracy and the urgent agenda to fight against its anti- democratic, fascist attacks against. As Lenin explains;

> " Since its immediate task is the overthrow of the autocracy, Social-Democracy must act as the vanguard in the fight for democracy, and consequently, if for no other reason, must give every support to all democratic elements of the population .. and win them as allies.
>
> The proletariat must not regard the other classes and parties as "one reactionary mass"; on the contrary, it must take part in all political and social life, support the progressive classes and parties against the reactionary classes and parties, support every revolutionary movement against the existing system, champion the

> interests of every oppressed nationality or race, of every persecuted religion, of the disfranchised sex, etc." (15)

Lenin speaking of autocratic countries says;

> " The day-to-day work, which the class-conscious proletariat should never forget under any circumstances, includes also the work of organisation. Without broad and diverse workers' organisations, and without their connection with revolutionary Social-Democracy, it is impossible to wage a successful struggle against the autocracy." (16)

In a struggle aiming the socialist revolution, "Our principal and fundamental task" says Lenin, " is to facilitate the political development and the political organisation of the working class. Those who push this task into the background, who refuse to subordinate to it all the special tasks and particular methods of struggle, are following a false path and causing serious harm to the movement. . (17)

It is beneficial to repeat Lenin's words again which says; " Social-Democrats…have always emphasized the dual manifestation and content of the class struggle of the proletariat and have always insisted on the inseparable connection between their socialist and democratic tasks—a connection clearly expressed in the name they have adopted " (13)

The struggle for the protection and expanding the Democratic rights is the preservation and expansion of struggle socialism, and also exposing the illusion of bourgeois democracy in the very practical life of the working masses. "The more democratic the system of government, the clearer will the workers see that the root evil is capitalism, not lack of rights." (18)

In addition, as Lenin puts it; ".. every resolute and consistent democratic demand of the proletariat always and everywhere in the world causes the bourgeoisie to recoil.. " (3)

Democratic struggle is also an undeniable task in order to bond with the masses. Vanguardship, Leadership cannot be achieved in one day, it can be gained in the process of struggles integrated with the masses. It is not through abstract call-outs like " Socialism now ", but through struggles for concrete, specific democratic rights. As Lenin puts it;

> "" if the working class stands out as the vanguard fighter for democratic institutions, this will strength the democratic movement, will strengthen the struggle for political liberty, because the working class will spur on all the other democratic and political opposition elements, will push the liberals towards the political radicals, will push the radicals towards an irrevocable rupture with the whole of the political and social structure of present society."(13)

So democratic struggle is unavoidable task, first of all for; 1) the development of revolutionary movement and the struggle 2) the exposure of bourgeoisie fraud in practice 3) the integration with the working masses, empowerment and gaining the leadership.

The history of struggle at every period encountered the problems of not being able to comprehend the dialectical connection between these two tasks and consequently without any regard to the specific conditions, have been rejecting either the democratic struggle (political), or the economic struggle (socialist).

"In our opinion the ground has been prepared for this sad state of affairs by three circumstances. First, in their early activity, Russian Social-Democrats restricted themselves merely to work

in propaganda circles. When we took up agitation among the masses, we were not always able to restrain ourselves from going to the other extreme. Secondly, in our early activity we often had to struggle for our right to existence against the Narodnaya Volya adherents, who understood by "politics" an activity isolated from the working-class movement and who reduced politics purely to conspiratorial struggle. In rejecting this sort of politics, the Social-Democrats went to the extreme of pushing politics entirely into the background. Thirdly, working in the isolation of small local workers' circles, the Social-Democrats did not devote sufficient attention to the necessity of organising a revolutionary party which would combine all the activities of the local groups and make it possible to organise the revolutionary work on correct lines. The predominance of isolated work is naturally connected with the predominance of the economic struggle." (17)

The approach, in order to set the balance in order not to deviate, is to subordinate the democratic struggle to socialist struggle and to safeguard the political independence in alliances. Because, isolated from political struggle " the working-class movement becomes petty and inevitably becomes bourgeois." That's why, its task is not to serve the working-class movement passively at each of its separate stages, but to represent the interests of the movement as a whole, to point out to this movement its ultimate aim and its political tasks, and to safeguard its political and ideological independence." (17)

Without waging a democratic struggle subordinated to socialist struggle, without creating a leadership embracing an organizing the masses, " without such organisation, the proletariat will never rise to the class-conscious struggle; without such organisation the working-class movement is doomed to impotency." (17)

Here comes another subject of justification for the left-deviation in order to reject the democratic struggle. They refuse all kind of alliances and conciliation under the pretext of " safeguarding their political and ideological independence." Although I will be taking the question of compromise on another title; "Lenin-On Compromise", it is important to touch the subject here in direct connection with the current title.

Lenin in "Left wing communism an infantile Disorder" states; "to reject compromises "on principle", to reject the permissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to consider seriously." ..There are different kinds of compromises. One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each variety of compromise.....It would be absurd to formulate a recipe or general rule ("No Compromises!") to serve all cases. One must use one's own brains and be able to find one's bearings in each separate case." He continues; " Naive and utterly inexperienced people imagine that it is sufficient to admit the permissibility of compromises in general in order to obliterate the dividing line between opportunism, against which we wage and must wage an irreconcilable struggle, and revolutionary Marxism, or Communism."

Conciliation for an alliance, requires to be in line with the interests of working peoples and their struggle and based on objective assessment of the concrete situation. A decision of support or an alliance made in line with this approach, is not called opportunism but a necessity for the struggle aiming a specific issue on the agenda.

" to refuse beforehand to manoeuvre, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporize and compromise with possible (even though temporary, unstable, vacillating, and conditional) allies

-- is not this ridiculous in the extreme? .. ..The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and without fail, most thoroughly, carefully, attentively, and skillfully using every, even the smallest, "rift" among the enemies,.. and also by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional. Those who fail to understand this, fail to understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern Socialism in general. Those who have not proved by deeds over a fairly considerable period of time, and in fairly varied political situations, their ability to apply this truth in practice have not yet learned to assist the revolutionary class in its struggle to emancipate all toiling humanity from the exploiters. And this applies equally to the period before and after the proletariat has conquered political power. "(12)

The confusion is in the difference between the support and or conciliation in general, and in particular. In some concrete situation cases, either negotiated or not, the support of an ally against the chief enemy, carries in it the protection of immediate, short term interests but also of the long -term interests. Socialists, "says Lenin, " support the progressive social classes against the reactionary classes, the bourgeoisie against the representatives of privileged landowning estate and the bureaucracy, the big bourgeoisie against the reactionary strivings of the petty bourgeoisie. This support does not presuppose, nor does it call for, any compromise with non-Social-Democratic programmes and principles—it is support given to an ally against a particular enemy. Moreover, the Social-Democrats render this support in order to expedite the fall of the common enemy, but expect nothing for themselves from these temporary allies, and concede nothing to them." (13)

In conclusion, there cannot be a socialist struggle by rejecting, ignoring the democratic tasks e.g. struggle for the protection and achievement of the existing and non-existing democratic rights and freedoms. Socialists struggle aiming to destroy the class system and to build a socialist society cannot be isolated from the democratic tasks which aims at gaining political freedom and democratize the existing political and social systems, struggles against the dictatorships, fascism, autocracy, religious reaction etc. The argument of" one is the tasks of the reformist" and" the other is the task of revolutionaries", is an argument from the marshes of revisionism regardless of how skillfully concealed with far-left slogans and phrase making.

Marxist Leninists are conscious of the fact that under capitalism women's rights cannot be acquired, but this fact has not prevented and will not prevent them from waging the democratic struggle for women's rights within the boundaries of capitalist system.

Marxist Leninists are conscious of the fact that under capitalism labor rights cannot be realized, but they do not desert the democratic struggle for these rights.

Marxist Leninists are conscious of the fact that under capitalism secularism cannot be realized, but they do wage a democratic struggle for secularism.

Marxist Leninists are conscious of the fact that under capitalism justice, equality cannot be realized, but they do not desert the democratic struggle for these rights.

Marxist Leninists are conscious of the fact that under capitalism the salvation of oppressed peoples cannot be realized, but they do not make an excuse and desert the democratic struggle for it.

For dozens of such democratic rights which under capitalism cannot be realized, Marxist Leninists do not give up the democratic struggle for those with an attitude of "" nothing will change anyway "".

Marxist Leninists, while struggling for these rights, also prevent the spread of illusion of possibility by emphasizing that it cannot be fully realized under capitalism.

Why? Because these are the tasks of democratic struggle which is an integral part of socialist struggle. This struggle is the practice of bonding with masses, educating and organizing them, and creating more appropriate condition and the environment for the socialist struggle. Without putting this struggle into practice, to speak about the socialist struggle is an illusion, reaction with left phrase making.

Reiterating Lenin's words;

"such a presentation of the question is too narrow, for it ignores the general democratic tasks" … "Can a class-conscious worker forget the democratic struggle for the sake of the socialist struggle, or forget the latter for the sake of the former? No, a class-conscious worker calls himself a Social-Democrat for the reason that he understands the relation between the two struggles… "Socialists "must rouse among the people consciousness of integral democratic tasks and imbue the proletariat with a clear understanding of revolutionary aims. "...We are in favour of democratic demands, we alone fight for them sincerely, for the objective historical situation prevents us from advancing them except in connection with the socialist revolution."

Notes and Related Articles to Read

The Years of Organizing – Pre 1903

(1) Petty-Bourgeois and Proletarian Socialism 1905 P211

(2) Reply to Criticism of our draft Programme 1903 P136

(3) Will the Sweep of the Democratic Revolution be Diminished if the Bourgeoisie Recoils from it? 1905 P175

(5) A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, "Monism and Dualism"

(10) A Letter to the Northern League

(13) The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats 1897 P25

(15) A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats 1899 P53

Draft of a Declaration of the Editorial Board of Iskra and Zarya 1900 P70

(17) The urgent Tasks of our Movement 1900 P83

A Talk with Defenders of Economism 1901 P97

The Working class as Vanguard for Democracy 1902 P108

(14) Political Agitation and "The Class Point of View" 190 P128

The years of preparation of the revolution (1903-05)

(16) The Autocracy and the Proletariat 1904 P156

From Narodism to Marxism 1905 P166

The Vulgar Bourgeois Representation of Dictatorship and Marx's View of It 1905 P199

The years of revolution (1905–07)

The Democratic Tasks of the Revolutionary Proletariat P222

(7) Stalin, Anarchism or Socialism? Dialectic Materialism P231

The years of reaction (1907–10)

The First Important Step 1907 P244

(4) The Agrarian Question & the Forces of the Revolution P249

(6) Speech on the Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties 1907 P254

(9) Report of the Commission Formed to Draft a Resolution on the State Duma 1907 P270

Revolution and Counter-Revolution 1907 P275

Lessons of the Commune 1908 P286

Those Who Would Liquidate Us 1911 P291

The First Imperialist World War (1914–17)

The Socialist Revolution& the Struggle for Democracy P296

(8) The Peace Programme 1916 P299

The Nascent Trend of Imperialist Economism 1916 P309

Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov) 1916 P321

To: N. I. Bukharin, 1916 P329

(18) A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, The Other Political Issues Raised and Distorted By P. Kievsky

The second revolution in Russia (February to October 1917)

(11) Letter on Tactics 1917 P335

(12) No Compromises? 1920 P351

On Parliamentarism and Parliamentary Struggle

"The dialectics of history were such that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to disguise themselves as Marxists. Liberalism, rotten within, tried to revive itself in the form of socialist opportunism. " (1)

Fundamental Marxist Leninist Approach on the choice of forms of struggle

Contrary to the arguments of Left deviations, Marxist Leninists never refuse a form of struggle, including and especially Parliamentary form of struggle. Argument as such is against the dialectics of Marxism. Lenin asks, " What are the fundamental demands which every Marxist should make of an examination of the question of forms of struggle?" and gives his answer;

"Marxism differs from all primitive forms of socialism by not binding the movement to any one particular form of struggle. It recognizes the most varied forms of struggle; and it does not "concoct" them, but only generalizes, organizes, gives conscious expression to those forms of struggle of the revolutionary classes which arise of themselves in the course of the movement. Absolutely hostile to all abstract formulas and to all doctrinaire recipes, Marxism demands an attentive attitude to the mass struggle in progress, which, as the movement develops, as the class-consciousness of the masses grows, as economic and political crises become acute, continually gives rise to new and more varied methods of defense and attack.. Marxism, therefore, positively does not reject any form of struggle. Under no circumstances does Marxism confine itself to the forms of struggle possible and in existence at the given moment only, recognizing as it does that new forms of struggle, unknown to the participants of the given period, inevitably arise as the given social situation, changes."

> "Marxism demands an absolutely historical examination of the question of the forms of struggle. To treat this question apart from the concrete historical situation betrays a failure to understand the rudiments of dialectical materialism. At different stages of economic evolution, depending on differences in political, national-cultural, living, and other conditions, different forms of struggle come to the fore and become the principal forms of struggle; and in connection with this, the secondary, auxiliary forms of struggle undergo change in their turn. To attempt to answer yes or no to the question whether any particular means of struggle should be used, without making a detailed examination of the concrete situation of the given movement at the given stage of its development, means completely to abandon the Marxist position.... These are the two principal theoretical propositions by which we must be guided. " (2)

Based on Lenin's assessment of the subject and Marxist - Leninist basic approach, far-left sloganized phrases such as " Marxist Leninists do not use parliament because it is pigsty of bourgeoise" , "no to parliament and election" - isolated from the concrete situation have nothing to do with Marxism- Leninism, but anti-Marxist-Leninist indeed. Both, theoretically and practically, it is unavoidable and expected for so many variations of Trotskyists to make such arguments for every condition.

During the years of Imperialist war, end of 1916, Lenin in his letter to Inessa Armand was saying; "How stupid that Levi is attacking parliamentarism!! Stupid!! And a “Left”, too!! God, how much muddle there is in people’s heads." "(3)

Undoubtedly these words of Lenin were not for "every condition" but he was emphasizing the stupidity of attacking to

parliamentarism on the basis of concrete assessment of that given concrete conditions.

Marxist Leninists do not reject the use of parliament, but they proceed from the historically proven fact that the usage of parliament is entirely contingent on the conditions of any given period and the balance of powers -between revolution and counter revolution. We should not confuse the times when the revolutionary struggle of the masses rising or has already risen, where the large masses do not have parliamentary illusions, where non-parliamentary struggle is widespread and strong, with the times when the revolutionary struggle weak, and where the parliamentary illusions and hopes of the masses are high. The approach and attitude at each given condition will be different. Meaning that the Marxist-Leninists do not approach to question as a " systematized-sloganized" recipe that is appropriate to every condition.

When Lenin was comparing the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic in his speech, he was explaining the importance of Parliament in the context of the development and struggle of working -class in general;

> " The democratic republic and universal suffrage were an immense progressive advance as compared with feudalism; they have enabled the proletariat to achieve its present unity and solidarity, to form those firm and disciplined ranks which are waging a systematic struggle against capital.
>
> The bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage—all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society. Mankind moved towards capitalism, and it was capitalism alone which, thanks to urban culture, enabled the oppressed proletarian class to become

> conscious of itself and to create the world working-class movement, the millions of workers organised all over the world in parties—the socialist parties which are consciously leading the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarism, without an electoral system, this development of the working class would have been impossible. That is why all these things have acquired such great importance in the eyes of the broad masses of people. That is why a radical change seems to be so difficult. " (4)

Above, Lenin is making his assessment on the basis of comparing feudalism, autocracy, etc. with bourgeois Democratic Republic. Widely extracted quote from the same speech below is the comparison of the Soviet system with the bourgeois parliamentary system.

"Whatever guise a republic may assume, however democratic it may be, if it is a bourgeois republic, if it retains private ownership of the land and factories, and if private capital keeps the whole of society in wage-slavery, that is, if the republic does not carry out what is proclaimed in the Programme of our Party and in the Soviet Constitution, then this state is a machine for the suppression of some people by others. And we shall place this machine in the hands of the class that is to overthrow the power of capital. . "(4)

The dialectical connection between the two is that the necessity of the destruction of parliament -which is one of the paths of the real revolution- without rejecting it, benefiting from its contribution. Failing in the grasp of Marxist dialectics will result in seeing these two aforementioned assessments as " contradiction ". The reformist embraces the first, rejects the second, " far-left" embraces the second, rejects the first. However, for this general rejection they bring out neither theoretical nor concrete historical practical illustration.

In regard to those reformists' perspective who memorized the first quote above and fitted themselves to it as Lenin says;

> " The opportunists of contemporary Social-Democracy, who have substituted Scheidemann for Marx, have memorized the rule that parliamentarism "should be utilized" (which is absolutely correct), but have forgotten what Marx taught concerning proletarian democracy as distinguished from bourgeois parliamentarism." (5)

In regard to far-left perspective, criticizing Bordiga at the International's second congress, Lenin says;

> " Comrade Bordiga seems to have wanted to defend the Italian Marxists' point of view here, yet he has failed to reply to any of the arguments advanced by other Marxists in favour of parliamentary action.
>
> Comrade Bordiga has admitted that historical experience is not created artificially. He has just told us that the struggle must be carried into another sphere. Is he not aware that every revolutionary crisis has been attended by a parliamentary crisis? True, he has said that the struggle must be carried into another sphere, into the Soviets. Bordiga, however, has himself admitted that Soviets cannot be created artificially. The example of Russia shows that Soviets can be organised either during a revolution or on the eve of a revolution. Even in the Kerensky period, the Soviets (which were Menshevik Soviets) were organised in such a way that they could not possibly constitute a proletarian government. Parliament is a product of historical development, and we cannot eliminate it until we are strong enough to disperse the bourgeois parliament. It is only as a member of the bourgeois parliament that

one can, in the given historical conditions, wage a struggle against bourgeois society and parliamentarianism. The same weapon as the bourgeoisie employs in the struggle must also be used by the proletariat, of course, with entirely different aims. You cannot assert that that is not the case, and if you want to challenge it, you will have thereby to erase the experience of all revolutionary developments in the world. "

This was to be seen in the case of Russia too. We were obliged to convene the Constituent Assembly even after the victory of the proletariat, so as to prove to the backward proletarians that they had nothing to gain from that Assembly. To bring home the difference between the two, we had to concretely contrapose the Soviets and the Constituent Assembly and to show the Soviets as the only solution. " (6)

If we take what Lenin has emphasized in his critic into account, it wouldn't be wrong to assume that there are two basic reasons why Marxist Leninists use parliament as a means ; first, to educate the masses through parliament by exposing the practices of all bourgeoisie parties, to show the working masses that the parliament cannot solve the problems, that in terms of solutions the parliament of the bourgeoisie is a lie and deception , second and most importantly, as Lenin stressed above, that parliamentary crisis is one of the most important element of the objective and subjective conditions of the revolution and that's why interrelated, directly dialectically connected with the revolution .

"Social-Democrats (Bolsheviks) regard parliamentarism (participation in representative assemblies) as one of the means of enlightening and educating the proletariat and organising it in an independent class party; as one of the methods of the

political struggle for the emancipation of the workers. This Marxist standpoint radically distinguishes Social-Democracy from bourgeois democracy, on the one hand, and from anarchism on the other...the participation of the Social-Democrats in the Duma campaign is of a quite different nature from that of other parties. Unlike them, we do not regard this campaign as an end in itself or even as being of cardinal importance. Unlike them, we subordinate this campaign to the interests of the class struggle." (7)

Marxist Leninists combine both extra-parliamentary (illegal) and parliamentary (legal) struggle depending on the conditions and balance of power.

" Tactics " says Lenin, "cannot be based on the bare fact that the oppressors deceive the people; tactics must be shaped after analyzing class relations in their entirety and the development of both extra-parliamentary and parliamentary struggle." "(8)

Another Lenin 's widely clipped quote is; "Bourgeois parliament is pigsty; revolutionaries don't work in pigsty". In relation to this, the same writing of Lenin above states;

> " they were based only on the "catchiness" of the boycott slogan and on the revulsion felt towards the brutal reaction of the June Third "pigsty". The objective situation, however, was such that on the one hand the revolution was in a state of collapse and declining fast. For the upsurge of the revolution a parliamentary base (even inside a "pigsty") was of tremendous political importance, since extra-parliamentary means of propaganda, agitation and organisation were almost nonexistent or extremely weak. On the other hand, the most openly reactionary nature of the Third Duma did not prevent it from being an organ reflecting real class relations, namely, the Stolypin combination of the

> monarchy and the bourgeoisie. This new relation of classes was something the country had to get rid of. (8)

As we can deduce from the quotes above, undoubtedly there is no connection with Marxism Leninism in denying Parliamentary struggle as a general rule. In regard to the trial of Group of Social Democrats in Duma Lenin was saying;

"the trial has revealed a picture without precedent in world socialism—that of revolutionary Social-Democracy making use of parliamentarianism. More than any speeches, this example will appeal to the minds and hearts of the proletarian masses; more convincingly than any arguments, it will refute the legalist opportunists and anarchist phrase-mongers. " (9)

Lenin was stressing that;

> " obligatory appointment of definitely revolutionary workers who are entirely free from traditions, habits, and prejudices of peaceful work, parliamentarism and legalism, and who, even if extremely inexperienced, are (1) capable of fighting reformism and opportunism (2) and are in close touch with the rank and file of the proletariat and with its most revolutionary section. (10)

Contrary to the far-left discourse Marxism-Leninism as a principle defending the use of Parliament proceeds from the principle that the use is totally contingent on the specific conditions of a given situation, and the concrete assessment of it.

In a different situation, for example, Lenin was saying;

> " As Social-Democrats we, of course, have recognised the obligation in principle of using parliamentarism as a weapon of the proletarian struggle. But the point is whether it is admissible for Social-Democrats to take part, in present conditions, in a “parliament” like our

> Duma. Is it admissible to form a parliamentary group without Social-Democratic members of parliament elected by workers' organisations? Our opinion is that it is not." (11)

It is clear that Lenin was not against parliamentarianism in principle. Contrary he was for the use of parliament in principle, but contingent on the concrete assessment of existing specific conditions. Every decision for a ML derives from and has in mind the interests of working class and of its struggle.

The same way that Lenin calls anti-parliamentarianism as "stupidity" in where the revolutionary situation does not exist, he calls parliamentarianism as "stupidity" in where the revolutionary situation is ripe, and riots have begun.

"It has become a commonplace for all opponents of revisionism or opportunism in parliamentary countries. It has become generally accepted as the legitimate and necessary rebuff to "parliamentary cretinism," Millerandism, Bernsteinism, and the Italian reformism of the Turati brand. .... The concept "opposition," which has become the reflection and the expression of a political situation in which no one seriously speaks of an insurrection, is senselessly applied to a situation in which insurrection has begun and in which all the supporters of the revolution are thinking and talking about leadership in it. The desire to "stick to" old methods, i.e., action only "from below," is expressed with pomp and clamor precisely at a time when the revolution has confronted us with the necessity, in the event of the insurrection being victorious, of acting from above. " (12)

We can find the different approach at different times, and the reason, as I have stressed earlier for the use of Parliament, in Lenin's following statement;

> "Prior to the capture of political power by the proletariat it was (obligatory) necessary to make use of bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism in particular, for the political education and organisation of the working masses; now that the proletariat has won political power and a higher type of democracy is being put into effect in the Soviet Republic, any step backward to bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy would undoubtedly be reactionary service to the interests of the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists." (13)

Lenin, with self-criticism states the different approach at different times:

" The Bolsheviks, it turned out, had a wrong attitude to parliamentarism in moments of revolutionary (and not constitutional) crises...

The Bolshevik participation in this hideous fraud, in this farce, had the same justification as their participation in the Third Duma ; even in a "pigsty" we must uphold our line, even from a "pigsty" we must send out material exposing the enemy for the instruction of the people.

The difference, however, is this, that the Third Duma was convened when the revolution was obviously ebbing, while at present there is an obvious upsurge of a new revolution; of the scope and the pace of this upsurge, however, we unfortunately know very little." (14)

Vulgar Anarchists, phrase-mongering opposition to parliamentarianism, especially in autocratic, fascist countries like Turkey ", neither conforms with the dialectic of Marxism nor with Leninism in its nature.

"For Marx", Lenin says "however, revolutionary dialectics was never the empty fashionable phrase, the toy rattle, which Plekhanov, Kautsky and others have made of it. Marx knew how to break with anarchism ruthlessly for its inability to make use even of the "pigsty" of bourgeois parliamentarism, especially when the situation was obviously not revolutionary; but at the same time, he knew how to subject parliamentarism to genuinely revolutionary proletarian criticism. "" (15)

What always interesting is that in countries like Turkey, the efforts, and approaches of left- deviation (Trotskyite variations) to dish out anarchism as Leninism is not any different from the history of "left- deviation " approach and the attitude in Russia. When Lenin criticized the Otzovists, he was exposing this clearly:

"You have memorised fragments of Bolshevik phrases and slogans but your understanding of them is precisely nil...

" The anarchists have absolutely never been able to understand this simple thing. Now our otzovists and their removed echoers are trying to introduce anarchist modes of thought among Russian Social-Democrats, crying out (like Maximov and Co.) that Proletary is dominated by the theory of "parliamentarism at any price".

> ... To show how stupid and un-Social-Democratic these out cries of Maximov and Co. are, we shall once more have to begin with the ABC. Just reflect, unjustly removed ones, what is the specific difference between the policy and tactics of the German Social-Democrats and those of the socialist workers' parties in other countries? The utilisation of parliamentarism; the conversion of bourgeois Junker (approximate Russian equivalent: Octobrist-Black-Hundred) parliamentarism into an instrument for the socialist education and

> organisation of the mass of the workers. Does this mean that parliamentarism is the highest form of struggle of the socialist proletariat? Anarchists the world over think it does mean that. "" (16)

For the participation in parliament, in a different country and for a different situation, comparing, Lenin said;

> "the question of parliamentarism is now a partial, secondary question. Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were, in my opinion, correct when they defended participation in the elections to the German bourgeois parliament, to the constituent National Assembly, at the January 1919 Conference of the Spartacists in Berlin, against the majority at the Conference.... I am personally convinced that to renounce participation in the parliamentary elections is a mistake on the part of the revolutionary workers of Britain, but better to make that mistake than to delay the formation of a big workers' Communist Party in Britain out of all the trends and elements. " .. (17)

Against the participation, Lenin for a different situation says;

> " The specific feature of the present state of the Russian revolution is that objective conditions are pushing into the forefront a resolute, extra-parliamentary struggle for parliamentarism; and for that reason, there can be nothing more harmful and dangerous at such a time than constitutional illusions and playing at parliamentarism. At such a time the parties of "parliamentary" opposition may be more dangerous and harmful than completely and avowedly reactionary parties: this proposition may sound paradoxical only to those who are totally incapable of thinking dialectically. "" (18)

Contrary to the Trotskyists and their tailgaters direct or indirect arguments or implications, it is very clear that Lenin did not have categorical rejecting attitude to parliamentarism. The same way, it is very clear that Lenin's attitude to the use of parliamentarism is not beyond its use as a means, it is not an end by itself. Lenin 's attitude to parliament has always been for the use of it as a means, and always stressed the necessity of preventing the spread of the parliamentary. Lenin who reads the article Lunacharsky wrote before its published notes;

" I believe the article should be revised along one of two lines: either the weight of emphasis should be shifted to our new-Iskrists, who are “playing at parliamentarism”, and you should demonstrate in detail the relative, temporary importance of parliamentarism, the futility of “parliamentary illusions” in an era of revolutionary struggle, etc., by explaining the whole thing from the beginning ... We must fight in a revolutionary way for a parliament, but not in a parliamentary way for a revolution; we must fight in a revolutionary way for a strong parliament, and not in an impotent “parliament” for a revolution"" (19)

These contradictory Parliamentarianism attitude in appearance is not comprehended in its dialectical connection, and insidiously used especially by the revisionists in order to confuse. As Lenin noted for Russian case, the attitude should be clarified for the masses to understand it correctly;

" People in Russia are now badly in need of having the relation between parliamentarism and revolution explained to them from the very beginning. (19)

One of the reason for the revolutionary masses fall in to disappointment in countries like Turkey is that, even if few, some of the so called leftists enter in the pigsty in compliance with the pigsty owners and becomes a promoter of pigsty even

up to the degree of throwing dirt to Stalin in the pigsty and becoming a spokesman for the pigsty . Lenin parliament into revolutionary parliamentary. For this reason, Lenin said;

" The party should demand of its parliamentary representatives, ...that they utilize their particularly advantageous political position, not for idle reformist parliamentary talk, which naturally only bores the workers and rouses their suspicion, but for propaganda for the socialist revolution . (20)

As we can easily see from the above citations, to oppose parliament and parliamentarism in principle is not Leninist but Trotskyite and anarchist approach. Marxist Leninists view the use of parliament as a necessary means to educate the masses, and both, for the parliamentary crisis being an important part of the objective of conditions of revolution, and its direct connection with the revolution, they would not reject the use of parliament. Contrary, Marxist Leninists, as long as the conditions permit are for the use of Parliament. “how is one to see what is what in the fight between the various parties? Does not this fight, with its fraud and advertising, indicate that representative institutions, parliaments, assemblies of people’s representatives, are in general useless and even harmful, as rabid reactionaries, the enemies of parliamentarism make out? “ asks Lenin, “No.” he responds, “ In the absence of representative institutions there is much more deception, political lying and fraudulent trickery of all kinds, and the people have much fewer means of exposing the deception and finding out the truth.” (Political Parties in Russia, CW V18, P44)

These words of Lenin below for the required specific " condition " assessment in order to determine the " use or reject of parliament should give a clear idea;

""How can one say that “parliamentarianism is politically obsolete”, when “millions” and “legions” of proletarians are not only still in favour of parliamentarianism in general, but are downright “counter-revolutionary”!? ..

...Parliamentarianism is of course “politically obsolete” to the Communists in Germany; but—and that is the whole point—we must not regard what is obsolete to us as something obsolete to a class, to the masses. Here again we find that the “Lefts” do not know how to reason, do not know how to act as the party of a class, as the party of the masses. You must not sink to the level of the masses, to the level of the backward strata of the class. That is incontestable. You must tell them the bitter truth. You are in duty bound to call their bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices what they are—prejudices. But at the same time, you must soberly follow the actual state of the class-consciousness and preparedness of the entire class (not only of its communist vanguard), and of all the working people (not only of their advanced elements)." (21)

Taking Advantage of Legal Opportunities During Reaction Period

The petty-bourgeois far-left (always understand this left opportunists and Trotskyites) approach to the topics, most typically has been in the form of "memorized phrase-mongering" and sloganization of theories regardless of the existing conditions. Generally, their heads buried in the sand defending "illegal struggle " only, they reject all kinds of legal democratic and socialist struggle, and label these struggles as” reformism " in order to prepare the justification and ratification of their escape form the daily struggle.

Lenin characterized the " otzovists " (those who qualify every legitimate struggle as reformism) for defending the tactics of Bolsheviks in where the revolutionary struggle was higher,

rejecting the benefit of legal opportunities in the period of reaction, as the " Caricatures of Bolshevism".

" To make the task of "strenuously opposing all deals" the pivot of our agitation today means making oneself a caricature of Bolshevism. " . (22)

For the so called far-left", current conditions and situation," " balance of powers", "interests of working class and her struggle ", etc. are concepts that has no meaning or importance. For they have become the experts of applying phrase making slogans as templates fitting their far-left subjectivity and drawing the worst cartoons of Bolshevism drawn.

In a similar situation of Turkey, where the far-left was against the Parliamentary struggle with the argument that" All reversion to parliamentary forms of struggle, which have become historically and politically obsolete, must be emphatically rejected..." Lenin responded to the German Communists;

""". . . All reversion to parliamentary forms of struggle, which have become historically and politically obsolete, must be emphatically rejected. . . ."

This is said with ridiculous pretentiousness and is patently wrong. "Reversion" to parliamentarianism, forsooth! Perhaps there is already a Soviet republic in Germany? It does not look like it! How, then, can one speak of "reversion"? Is this not an empty phrase?" (21)

Lenin brings the following example and explanation of the importance of the use of Parliament, especially in reactionary Periods;

"" it has been proved that, far from causing harm to the revolutionary proletariat, participation in a bourgeois-democratic parliament, even a few weeks before the victory of

a Soviet republic and even after such a victory, actually helps that proletariat to prove to the backward masses why such parliaments deserve to be done away with; it facilitates their successful dissolution, and helps to make bourgeois parliamentarianism “politically obsolete” ."

> ""We Bolsheviks participated in the most counterrevolutionary parliaments, and experience has shown that this participation was not only useful but indispensable to the party of the revolutionary proletariat, after the first bourgeois revolution in Russia (1905), so as to pave the way for the second bourgeois revolution (February 1917), and then for the socialist revolution (October 1917). . "" (21)

For those who hide behind a far-left mask as an easy way to escape from struggle without being seen as reactionary, Lenin says;

" it is very easy to show one’s “revolutionary” temper merely by hurling abuse at parliamentary opportunism, or merely by repudiating participation in parliaments; it’s very easy, however, cannot turn this into a solution of a difficult, a very difficult, problem."

" Criticism—the most keen, ruthless and uncompromising criticism—should be directed, not against parliamentarianism or parliamentary activities, but against those leaders who are unable—and still more against those who are unwilling—to utilise parliamentary elections and the parliamentary rostrum in a revolutionary and communist manner." (21)

Lenin while specifying the difference between those with " either - or " approach who draw a bad caricature of Bolshevism states the following;

" Our tactics are different. We make use of every reform (insurance, for example) and of every legal society. But we use them to develop the revolutionary consciousness and the revolutionary struggle of the masses. ." (23)

The problem is not only to take advantage of legal opportunities for the interests of the revolutionary struggle, it is the assessment of how to take advantage of the opportunities and to what degree. In this regard Lenin says;

> " It amuses us to hear the liquidators say, for example, that we are opposed to "freedom of association", for we not only emphasised the importance of this point of our programme in a special resolution adopted by the January Conference of 1912, but we made ten times more effective use of the curtailed right of association than the liquidators did. . " (23)

What decisive is, taking advantage of legal opportunities within a reformists outlook, or revolutionary outlook. Lenin, in reference to make use of it how the Bolsheviks should use the legal of possibilities gives the example of 1903 1905, 1905-1907 and 1917- 1920 periods:

"1905-07 revolution years. The alternation of parliamentary and non-parliamentary forms of struggle, of the tactics of boycotting parliament and that of participating in parliament, of legal and illegal forms of struggle, and likewise their interrelations and connections—all this was marked by an extraordinary wealth of content. .."

Conference of our Party began to state officially in the name of the Party—that a bourgeois republic with a Constituent Assembly would be better than a bourgeois republic without a Constituent Assembly, but that a "workers' and peasants' " republic, a Soviet republic, would be better than any bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary republic. Without such thorough,

circumspect, and long preparations, we could not have achieved victory in October 1917, or have consolidated that victory. "" (24)

Lenin's statement for the years of reaction 1907-1910 is quite valid for the phrase-mongerers who refuses the use of legal opportunities:

> "1907-10 reactionary years, Tsarism was victorious. All the revolutionary and opposition parties were smashed.
>
> "Of all the defeated opposition and revolutionary parties, the Bolsheviks effected the most orderly retreat, with the least loss to their "army", with its core best preserved, with the least significant splits (in point of depth and incurability), with the least demoralisation, and in the best condition to resume work on the broadest scale and in the most correct and energetic manner. The Bolsheviks achieved this only because they ruthlessly exposed and expelled the revolutionary phrase-mongers, those who did not wish to understand that one had to retreat, that one had to know how to retreat, and that one had absolutely to learn how to work legally in the most reactionary of parliaments, in the most reactionary of trade unions, co-operative and insurance societies and similar organisations." (24)

While explaining the later years, " revival " period of 1910-1914, Lenin explains the importance of the use of legal opportunities during the years of reaction:

> "At first progress was incredibly slow, then, following the Lena events of 1912, it became somewhat more rapid. Overcoming unprecedented difficulties, the Bolsheviks thrust back the Mensheviks, whose role as bourgeois agents in the working-class movement was clearly realized by the entire bourgeoisie after 1905, and

> whom the bourgeoisie therefore supported in a thousand ways against the Bolsheviks. But the Bolsheviks would never have succeeded in doing this had they not followed the correct tactics of combining illegal work with the utilization of "legal opportunities", which they made a point of doing. In the elections to the arch-reactionary Duma, the Bolsheviks won the full support of the worker curia. . " (24)

Again, Lenin summarizes the importance of this use during the years of imperialist World War, 1914-1917:

> "Legal parliamentarianism, with an extremely reactionary "parliament", rendered most useful service to the Bolsheviks, the party of the revolutionary proletariat. ." (24)

Whether to use the legal possibilities or not depends on the balance of powers of that particular stage. Where the Leadership, organization's, and the struggles of the mass of people at its peak, the use of legal opportunities may (most likely) not be needed. However, when the specific situation, balance of power is against our favor, as the examples given by the Bolsheviks and particularly during the reactionary period, the use of legal opportunities for the interests of socialist revolution is a necessity. Because at times of reaction where the offensive of capital to the working class and to all strata of people, the purposes of revolutionary organization, the cohesion with the masses, gaining their leadership through practical struggle for empowerment, strength and changing the balance of power are dialectically connected.

During the periods of reaction rejection of the use of legal opportunities, (in most cases) does not strengthen the struggle but serves the interests of reaction through the practice of far-left in words, pacifism indeed. Because strengthening of the

struggle strictly depends on the movement's establishment of bonds with the masses whom facing the attacks of reaction and suffering from it. Struggle cannot develop and cannot be strengthened by abandoning the masses. Especially during the years of reaction in order to bond with the masses to take advantage of all legal opportunities for the interests of the struggle is a must. During the years of reaction, Lenin points out;

> "The present new conditions require new forms of struggle. The use of the Duma tribune is an absolute necessity. A prolonged effort to educate and organise the masses of the proletariat becomes particularly important. The combination of illegal and legal organisation raises special problems before the Party. "(25)

Lenin summarizes the responsibility of the socialists to the masses and struggle;

> "Needless to say, the task of these cells and committees must be to utilize all the semi-legal and as far as possible, legal organisations, to maintain "close contact with the masses", and to direct the work in such a way that Social-Democracy responds to all the needs of the masses.. (25)

Is there any way to deduce anything else form Lenin's assessments other than that, especially during the years of reaction, it is the task of revolutionaries to utilize every legal possibility for the benefit of revolutionary struggle?

In reference to parliamentarianism as one of the forms of struggle Lenin states;

> " Parliamentarism is one form of activity, journalism is another. The content of both can be communist, and it

should be communist if those engaged in both spheres are real Communists, are real members of a proletarian mass party. Yet, in neither sphere -- nor in any other sphere of activity under capitalism and during the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism -- is it possible to avoid those difficulties which the proletariat must overcome, those special problems which the proletariat must solve in order to utilize for its own purposes the services of those who have come from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, in order to gain the victory over bourgeois intellectual prejudices and influences, in order to weaken the resistance of (and, ultimately, completely to transform) the petty-bourgeois environment. "

The childishness of those who "repudiate" participation in parliament consists precisely in the fact that they think it possible to "solve " the difficult problem of combating bourgeois-democratic influences within the working-class movement by such a "simple," "easy," supposedly revolutionary method, when in reality they are only running away from their own shadow, only closing their eyes to difficulties, and only trying to brush them aside with mere words... the attempt to brush aside, to fence oneself off from one of the "unpleasant" problems or difficulties in one sphere of activity is a profound mistake, for which will later most certainly have to be paid. We must study and learn how to master every sphere of work and activity without exception, to overcome all difficulties and all bourgeois habits, customs, and traditions everywhere. Any other way of presenting the question is just trifling, just childishness. "" (26)

Revolutionaries are " hopeful " and in this sense, in this subject, what they want to realize , and the society they believe in, in that sense is a " dream", but they are not "dreamers" when it comes to the concrete conditions and situations", they are realists who rely on the assessment of the concrete situation. Exampling Turkey, in such a reactionary period, where the revolutionary forces are the weakest in their entire history of struggle to reject the utilization of parliament, is similar to a patient who has the possibility of recovery preferring to remain in vegetative state rather than struggling for recovery.

What is most interesting as well is that; "head in the sand body outside" ostrich like some "illegal," left-wing parties such as in Turkey , "the illegal communist party " far-left the phrase-mongering is "left in words" and "pacifist indeed" to a degree that falls to the right of reformists.

In the specific tactical practice for the subject of boycotting or participating in the parliamentary elections, the clear outlining finds itself in the words of Stalin;

" To accelerate or retard the movement, facilitate, or hinder it—such is the field and the limits within which political strategy and tactics can be applied. ""

"" Tactics are a part of strategy, subordinated to and serving it. ..Strategy strives to win the war, or to carry through the struggle, against tsarism let us say to the end; tactics, on the contrary, strive to win particular engagements and battles, to conduct particular campaigns successfully, or particular operations, which are more or less appropriate to the concrete situation of the struggle at each given moment.

A most important function of tactics is to determine the ways and means, the forms and methods of fighting that are most appropriate to the concrete situation at the given moment and are most certain to prepare the way for strategic success.

Consequently, the operation and results of tactics must be regarded not in isolation, not from the point of view of their immediate effect, but from the point of view of the aims and possibilities of strategy..

tactics must not be subordinated to the transient interests of the moment, they must not be guided by considerations of immediate political effect, still less must they desert firm ground and build castles in the air. Tactics must be devised in accordance with the aims and possibilities of strategy.

The function of tactics is primarily to determine— in accordance with the requirements of strategy, and taking into account the experience of the workers' revolutionary struggle in all countries—the forms and methods of fighting most appropriate to the concrete situation of the struggle at each given moment. . "" (27)

Especially during the period of reaction where the revolutionary leadership and organization is weak to utilize the legal opportunities in the interests of working people and their struggle is the integral and inevitable part of revolutionary struggle. At the time of the reactionary period and the unfavorable conditions and balance of power ,to reject every legal form of struggle and to utilize them for the interests of working class and its struggle can only be the work of the left-wing phrase mongerers who draw the worst caricature of Marxism, Leninism .

In the case of Turkey for example, what is proposed behind far-left phrase mongering? Is the current question to replace one ruling party with another, or democracy (even in its bourgeois meaning) against Autocracy? The utopic baseless approach of" either all or nothing" cannot see the difference. In this subject Lenin states;

" In politics utopia is a wish that can never come true—neither now nor afterwards, a wish that is not based on social forces and is not supported by the growth and development of political, class forces.

The less freedom there is in a country, the scantier the manifestations of open class struggle and the lower the educational level of the masses, the more easily political utopias usually arise and the longer they persist. "(28)

Thus, far-left phrase mongers not only pacify the masses but at the same time serve the interests of reaction. Lenin in his speech at the Extra Ordinary 7th Congress of the RCPB says; "we must now write a new Programme of Soviet power and not in any way reject the use of bourgeois parliamentarism. It is a utopia to think that we shall not be thrown back." At the same congress in another speech he says; "We ought not in any way to give the impression that we attach absolutely no value to bourgeois parliamentary institutions…. we cannot leave the way open for a purely anarchist denial of bourgeois parliamentarism."

Yes, Parliament is a " pigsty " of the bourgeoisie - especially under autocracy, it has no function at all. But " the objective situation, however, was such that on the one hand the revolution was in a state of collapse and declining fast. For the upsurge of the revolution a parliamentary base (even inside a "pigsty") was of tremendous political importance, since extra-parliamentary means of propaganda, agitation and organisation were almost nonexistent or extremely weak." (8)

Lenin's forgotten or overlooked following statement is important to comprehend and take note of;

> "Experience has proved that, on certain very important questions of the proletarian revolution, all countries will inevitably have to do what Russia has done. "(24)

There cannot be any revolutionary struggle with catchy phrases, slogans that appeal to petty bourgeois subjectivity. This approach harms the revolutionary struggle because it serves the reaction due to the promotion of passivity. This is precisely the task of Trotskyists stemming from their ideology and their historical servile practice to serve the interests of bourgeoisie.

The argument that there is no difference between an Autocracy and Parliamentary Republic has nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism and its dialectics.

Yes, as Engels points out, " as in a democratic republic, "no less" than in a monarchy, the state remains a "machine for the oppression of one class by another" however " by no means (it) signifies that the form of oppression makes no difference to the proletariat, as some anarchists “teach”. "

"A wider, freer and more open form of the class struggle and of class oppression vastly assists the proletariat in its struggle for the abolition of classes in general....For such a republic, without in the least abolishing the rule of capital, and, therefore, the oppression of the masses and the class struggle, inevitably leads to such an extension, development, unfolding, and intensification of this struggle that, as soon as it becomes possible to meet the fundamental interests of the oppressed masses, this possibility is realized inevitably and solely through the dictatorship of the proletariat, through the leadership of those masses by the proletariat. These, too, are "forgotten words" of Marxism for the whole of the Second International, and the fact that they have been forgotten was demonstrated with particular vividness by the history of the Menshevik Party during the first six months of the Russian revolution of 1917." (29)

Especially if we talk about the countries where the democratic revolution has not been carried out and completed;

> " To the proletarian the struggle for political liberty and a democratic republic in a bourgeois society is only one of the necessary stages in the struggle for the social revolution which will overthrow the bourgeois system. Strictly differentiating between stages that are essentially different, soberly examining the conditions under which they manifest themselves, does not at all mean indefinitely postponing one's ultimate aim, or slowing down one's progress in advance. On the contrary, it is for the purpose of accelerating the advance and of achieving the ultimate aim as quickly and securely as possible that it is necessary to understand the relation of classes in modern society. " (30)

Lenin was emphasizing and summarizing the essence of question in his critique of Bordiga's anti- parliamentarianism;

" Parliament is a product of historical development, and we cannot eliminate it until we are strong enough to disperse the bourgeois parliament. It is only as a member of the bourgeois parliament that one can, in the given historical conditions, wage a struggle against bourgeois society and parliamentarianism. The same weapon as the bourgeoisie employs in the struggle must also be used by the proletariat, of course, with entirely different aims." (6)

CONCLUSION

The hostility of Trotskyists since 1903 and especially after the revolution against the Bolsheviks and against the revolution - either voluntary or salaried - services to counter revolution is not secret to people who are capable of critical and objective thinking. When Lenin said that whatever Mensheviks of today

are, will be of tomorrow, he was not making a statement of prophecy. He was emphasizing the inevitable practical consequence of Trotskyite ideology. With all the variations shaping themselves and fitting the conditions of countries they are in, with their far-left phrase mongering in some, reformist phrasings in others, they keep on serving the counter revolution.

In a country where a functioning parliament does not exist but an autocratic regime reigns, in where almost 100% of population have parliamentary hopes and revolutionary struggle is weak to a degree that almost non-exist , to reject the " parliamentary form of struggle " can only be a Trotskyists counter revolutionary approach in the service of autocracy.

For those who can comprehend, let's leave the words to Lenin;

> " There is capitalism and capitalism. There is Black-Hundred-Octobrist (autocratic, reactionary) capitalism and Narodnik ("realistic, democratic", full of "activity") capitalism. The more we expose capitalism before the workers for its "greed and cruelty", the more difficult is it for capitalism of the first order to persist, the more surely is it bound to pass into capitalism of the second order. And this just suits us, this just suits the proletariat.
>
> Do you think I have fallen into a contradiction? In the beginning of the letter I considered the words "realism, democracy, activity" bad words, and now I find them good? There is no contradiction here; what is bad for the proletariat is good for the bourgeois... "" (31)

The critique of parliamentarianism approach is not and should not be a critique just directed against the reformists. The reformist approach is easily visible to everyone who has the basic knowledge of Marxism -Leninism. But the most

important and most dangerous ones are those cannot be easily seen due to the "Leninist disguise" directed to the petty bourgeois subjectivity and " a way out of struggle" with " far-left ", "catchy " slogans, and phrase making by those Trotskyites and anarchists. Although they never had and do not have any roots in working masses, historical proven fact that they are very effective in creating confusion among the masses.

The question of parliamentarism, parliamentary struggle should always be taken in direct connection with the existing condition and situation of that given period , based on the strength or weakness of revolutionary struggle - the degree of the parliamentary illusion of the masses- at that moment and always the interests of the working class and their struggle in mind. As Lenin puts it; " It is naive to take parliamentarism "in its pure form", as an "idea", isolated from the real situation" (32).The approach - without denying some possible exceptions- will be contradictory in periods where the revolutionary situation exists and where it does not. Based on the experience of Russian revolution, it is safe to say that the Marxist-Leninist approach follows the logic of" parliamentary struggle - uprising - gaining the majority in parliament - uprising - proletarian dictatorship (or worker-peasant dictatorship in some cases).

Notes and Related Articles to Read

The tasks of the Russian Social Democrats P44

The years of preparation of the revolution (1903-05)

The Principal Stages in the History of Bolshevism (24) P74

(30) Autocracy and ProletariatP81

The years of revolution (1905–07)

(12) Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution P92

Victory of the Cadets & the Tasks of the Workers' Party (18) P97

To: A. V. Lunacharsky 156 (19) P144

Guerrilla Warfare (2) P147

(11)An Appeal to the Party by Delegates to the Unity Congress Who Belonged to the Former "Bolshevik" Group P151

A New Uprising P158

Postscript to the Article: "The Social-Democrats and the Election Campaign" P166

(7)The Social-Democrats and the Election Agreement" P169

The Vulgar Bourgeois Representation of Dictatorship and Marx's View of It P493

Attitude Towards the State Duma P506

On the Question of the Attitude To the State Duma (32) P519

The Role and Significance of a Cadet Duma P527

The years of reaction (1907–10)

(25)Lenin, On the Road P171

(22) A Caricature of Bolshevism P183

(16) The Faction of Supporters of Otzovism and God-Building P199

The years of revival (1910–14)

(31)Letter to Maxim Gorky P240

(28)Two Utopias P245

(1) The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx P251

Report of the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P. to the Brussels Conference (23) and Instructions to the C.C. Delegation P256

The First Imperialist World War (1914–17)

(9)What Has Been Revealed By the Trial of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Duma Group P308

(20) Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists in the Swiss Social-Democratic Party P324

Junius, The crisis of Social- Democracy P338

The Socialist Revolution and the Struggle for Democracy P346

Lenin, To: Inessa Armand (3) P349

The second revolution in Russia (February to October 1917)

A Proletarian Militia (5) P351

Abolition of Parliamentarism (15) P356

(6) Speech on Parliamentarism P435

(8) The Mistakes Of Our PartyP375

(10)Material for the Second Congress of the Communist International P408

(13)Lenin, Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.) P447

(14) Heroes of Fraud and the Mistakes of the Bolsheviks P364

The State: A Lecture Delivered at the Sverdlov University (4) P384

(17) Lenin, Letter to Sylvia Pankhurst P414

(21)Should We Participate in Bourgeois Parliaments? P422

(26)Incorrect conclusions from Concrete premises P440

(27)Stalin, Concerning the Question of the Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists P456

The 1891 Preface to Marx's "The Civil War in France" P477

(29) State and revolution, Controversy with the Anarchists P487

ON PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

LENIN ON INSURRECTION AND REVOLUTIONARY DEMOCRACY

Among ML Revolutionaries, eclectic memorization of theories and revolutionary phrase making is another byproduct of ML theory not being able to be applied correctly to the practice in any given "concrete" situations.

The fundamental reason for deducing wrong approach and drawing wrong conclusion from the right theories is that the "theories" remain abstract and thus prevents formulating any concrete strategy for the specific conditions and situation, in a way that can be understood by the masses.

Marxism is related to the essence of thing not to the forms- yet not denying the importance of forms. It is not the form of revolution, name of party, or of power that is important, but the class essence. To call a power structure as "People's Power", "People's Democracy", or "Labor Democracy" does not determine its class essence. A power called "People's Democracy" could be the power of working class, yet another called "Worker's democracy" could well be a bourgeois power. What determines is the hegemony of class that holds the power. Naming may have tactical reasons both for Socialists and Bourgeoisie. Stalin's comment on the subject of setting up a "Labor Party" in Bulgaria may be a good example for this. Stalin says;

> "You must unite the working class and the other working strata on the basis of a minimal programme, and later there will be time for maximal program. Peasants consider the worker's party as alien, but they will look at labor party as their own. I strongly recommend that you do that. A labor party or worker-peasant party is very suitable for a country like Bulgaria

> from the point of view of the country's international position, which would only make your tasks easier for you. In character the party will be communist, but it will have a broader basis and a convenient mask for the present period. *"(1)*

The importance of the name used may be considered in conjunction with its ability to embrace larger masses on the path of revolutionary struggle and ensure their support, and to maintain power. Decision depends on the concrete assessment of concrete situation and class relations at that given time for Marxists proceed from the principle that " a Marxist should not leave the real ground in the analysis of inter-class relations." Lenin (2)

The group that will quickly embrace the slogan of the "People's Democracy", obviously, will be the reformists, petty bourgeois who still have great hopes, illusions for the bourgeois parliament and fear of revolution. Because, according to them, "People's Democracy" will provide democratic rights and liberties within the existing system, and its purpose will be limited to the protection and "improvement" of the existing system. Their kin, left-opportunists however, hiding behind far-left slogans, will label the "People's Democracy" as reformist.

Having said that, the approach to the terms should not be in their literal meaning, taken from dictionary, encyclopedia, or from a concocted meaning, but in its historical context and historical, Marxist Leninist theoretical use of the terms. If not done so, conclusions reached will have nothing to do with the ABCs of Marxism Leninism as one "theoretician !!" of a left!! magazine states; "Revolutionary Democracy is the reaction of middle bourgeoisie." Proletarian revolution has an unbreakable connection with the democratic revolution and the dictatorship of workers-peasants in most of the countries of the

world. It is not the "reaction of middle bourgeois", but as Lenin puts it; "Revolutionary democracy, i.e., in the main, the proletariat, and Social-Democracy"…"By revolutionary democracy is meant the consistent and firm democratic currents that accept the whole democratic programme of Social-Democracy, do not hold back from any revolutionary measures, but lack the clear Social-Democratic class consciousness". So Revolutionary democracy has nothing to do with the "middle bourgeoisie" but it is mainly the alliance of the socialists with the revolutionary democrat currents.

Obviously, without some exceptions stated below, general use of "People's Democracy" has a strategic content that somehow involves the popular-elections and especially the utilization of parliament in connection with the insurrection for "revolutionary democracy as a bridge"-which is our main subject to discuss. As the quotes will show, historically the term "People's Democracy "is used for countries who waged anti-fascist and anti-imperialist wars in where the bourgeoisie escaped, in others became a part or supporter of the new type of proletarian power in the form of "People's Democracy", in others a dictatorship of proletariat and peasants, while in some, an alliance between the anti-imperialist bourgeoisie, peasants and workers. Each varied in class content.

On January 27, 1918, a revolution in Finland began in response to a call from the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland, deposed bourgeois government and placed power in the hands of the workers. On January 29, a revolutionary government of Finland was set up in the shape of the Council of People's Representatives." Lenin mentioning Finland in his speech at Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) said:

> "Because we are standing on the shoulders of the Paris Commune and the many years of development of

> German Social-Democracy, we have conditions that enable us to see clearly what we are doing in creating Soviet power. Despite all the crudity and lack of discipline that exist in the Soviets—this is a survival of the petty-bourgeois nature of our country—despite all that the new type of state has been created by the masses of the people. It has been functioning for months and not weeks, and not in one city, but throughout a tremendous country, populated by several nations. This type of Soviet power has shown its value since it has spread to Finland, a country that is different in every respect, where there are no Soviets but where there is, at any rate, a new type of power, proletarian power."

Lenin's conclusion that the Soviets were not the only form of the dictatorship of the proletariat was subsequently fully confirmed. After the Second World War a new form of dictatorship of the proletariat arose in a number of countries of Europe and Asia. This was called "people's democracy", which reflected the distinctive development of socialist revolution at a time when imperialism had been weakened and the balance of forces had tilted in favour of socialism."

Explaining the specificity of this era, Cominform states; "The defeat of fascist Germany and militarist Japan as a result of the world-historic victory of the Soviet Union in World War II, the rise of the countries of people's democracy and the weakening of the forces of world imperialism constituted most important factors stimulating a new powerful upsurge of the national-liberation struggle in the dependent countries and in the colonies and aggravating the crisis of the entire colonial system of imperialism. "Cominform No. 2 (218), January 9, 1953, And as a result of "the smashing by the Soviet Army of fascist Germany and imperialist Japan in World War II further weakened the imperialist camp and gave a fresh impetus to the

revolutionary struggle waged by the working class and to the national-liberation movement against imperialism. In a number of countries of Central and South-East Europe there was established the system of people's democracy. In Asia there arose the Korean People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. *"Cominform No. 9 (173), February 29, 1952*

In this sense Bulgaria is an important example. At the end of the war, the Communists in Bulgaria seized the majority in parliament. Stalin explains this exception and that "People's power" in this case was another form of dictatorship of the working class;

> "The proletariat is known two forms of dictatorship. As the first of Marx and Engels in Paris he saw the Commune and argued, democratic Republic with a majority of the proletariat, the best form of proletarian dictatorship ... Lenin had the Soviet form suitable to our conditions formulated. Here, the Russian Soviet form The power of the working class was proved to be the easiest way to seize power in your country, where the power of the working class was seized, not from the insurrection, but from outside (Soviet Army), you can go back to the Marx and Engels model without the Soviet form. People's Democracy will play the role of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.
>
> (in Bulgaria) The capitalists and the Landlords have fought against us for four years, and they have surrendered without war and fled. "(1)

Explaining the context and the differences, Cominform states:

> "It would be a transition to a non-capitalist power, or to be more precise, to the socialist development of China, said Comrade Stalin. State power in China is not the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in this it differs from

the state power in the European countries of People's Democracy where this democracy fulfils the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the People's Democracy in China is the state power of the People's Democratic United Front of the working class, peasants, petty-bourgeoisie, national-bourgeoisie, and other patriotic democratic elements based on the alliance of workers and peasants and led by the working class. The task of the People's Democracy in China at this stage is to carry out agrarian reform, to consolidate the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, to draw into active political life hundreds of millions of people, economic rehabilitation, and industrialization of the country, to strengthen and broaden the foundation of public property, to restore and develop the economy, to raise the living standard of the working people and to effect the cultural revolution. The Central People's Government of China is building up the defense of the country against imperialist aggression." *Cominform, September 29, 1950*

"In the People's Democracies historical successes in working class unity have also been won: united working class parties, united trade unions, united cooperatives, youth, women's, and other organizations have been established.

This working-class unity has played a decisive role in the successes achieved in the economic and cultural advance in the People's Democracies, in securing the leading role of the working class in the State and in a radical improvement in the material welfare of the working masses." Resolution adopted by the Meeting of the Cominform, November 1949

However, "The nature of the people's democratic state power in China is defined by the conditions in this recently colonial country. At present the working people of China are not

confronted directly with the task of building Socialism, the instrument of which is the dictatorship of the proletariat." *From "Cominform, September 29, 1950*

Lenin was stressing the importance and yet making the distinction clearly in his speech at Extraordinary All- Russia Railway men's Congress;

> "We have been openly and straightforwardly saying from the very start of the revolution—April 1917—that the Soviets were a much higher, a very much more perfect and purposeful form of democracy—a working people's democracy—than the Constituent Assembly. The Constituent Assembly unites all classes, which means also the exploiter classes, the propertied classes, hence, the bourgeoisie and those who received their education at the expense of the people, at the expense of the exploited, and abandoned the people to join the capitalists, turning their knowledge, the greatest achievements of knowledge, into a tool for oppressing the people, and fighting the working classes. For our part we declare that when a revolution of the working and exploited classes breaks out, all power in the state goes to their organisation. This form of democracy is incomparably higher than the old one. No party invented the Soviets. You know very well that no party could have invented them. They were brought to life by the 1905 revolution."

Since Marxists proceed from the assessment of concrete conditions and situations and cannot leave the real ground in the analysis of inter-class relations, under current conditions speaking of "People's Democracy" should not be taken the same as in its exceptional context but in the context of a "Revolutionary Democracy", as a phase and a bridge to

socialist revolution, with some possible exception, in all countries.

Studying the Russian history of revolution, Lenin's writings, and his foresight in "the principal stages in the History of Bolshevism" that the ""history has proven that in some very important problems of the proletarian revolution, all countries will inevitably have to do what Russia has done" , we can assume the dialectically connected, uninterrupted phases as; "insurrection - revolutionary democracy" followed by "Revolutionary Democracy – insurrection – socialist revolution."

Any "democracy "- with any prefix- as an end to itself, by itself is a deviation from Marxism Leninism, is the denial of Proletarian Dictatorship – Socialism.

All the "democracy" - with any prefix- should be taken within the context of class and class power and whether it is aiming at socialist revolution or not.

" In dealing with the idea of control and the question of when and by whom this control is to be affected," says Lenin, "one must not for a single moment forget the class character of the modern state, which is merely an organisation of class rule. A similar class analysis should be applied to the concept "revolutionary democracy", and this analysis should be based on the actual balance of social forces." (3)

The concept should be used by Marxist Leninists with its class context distinctive from the reformists' use. Clarifying that "Revolutionary Democracy" is not an invention but a phase between the capitalism and socialism that advanced by the revolution, Lenin states;

> "what is this revolutionary democracy that people here speak so much about to conceal their utter

> misunderstanding and complete repudiation of it? To talk about revolutionary democracy at the All-Russia Congress of Soviets and obscure this institution's character, its class composition, and its role in the revolution… This is a type of state not invented by the Russians but advanced by the revolution because the revolution can win in no other way…. We are asked whether socialism can be introduced in Russia, and whether, generally speaking, radical changes can be made at once. That is all empty talk comrades. .. Nowhere in the world is there pure capitalism developing into pure socialism, nor can there be in wartime. But there is something in between, something new and unprecedented... If you want to talk of "revolutionary" democracy, then you must distinguish this concept from reformist democracy under a capitalist Ministry." (4)

Let's touch base on some of the basic aspects in light of our current world's facts.

The importance of a bourgeois democratic system with a constituent assembly in countries where it does not exist.

Marxism Leninism must be dealt with in a dialectical unity and applied to the concrete conditions. The forms, means and methods of struggle and path to the revolution will differ in each country; where feudal or semi-feudal structure, and/or autocracy, fascism reigns will be different than where a bourgeois democratic state with constituent assembly reigns. And most importantly depends on the availability of the objective and subjective conditions of a country in any given time.

Lenin stressing the importance and making the comparison, in his article mentioned above in which he summarizes the main

stages of the history of Bolshevism by saying, "history has proven that, in some very important problems of the proletarian revolution, all countries will inevitably have to do what Russia has done", finishes his writing as follows;

> "" Despite views that are today often to be met with in Europe and America, the Bolsheviks began their victorious struggle against the parliamentary and (in fact) bourgeois republic and against the Mensheviks in a very cautious manner, and the preparations they made for it were by no means simple. At the beginning of the period mentioned, we did not call for the overthrow of the government but explained that it was impossible to overthrow it without first changing the composition and the temper of the Soviets. We did not proclaim a boycott of the bourgeois parliament, the Constituent Assembly, but said that a bourgeois republic with a Constituent Assembly would be better than a bourgeois republic without a Constituent Assembly, but that a "workers' and peasants' " republic, a Soviet republic, would be better than any bourgeois-democratic, parliamentary republic. Without such thorough, circumspect, and long preparations, we could not have achieved victory in October 1917, or have consolidated that victory." (5)

And Lenin in his critique below, stresses the fact that the socialist revolution is not a single battle, but a period covering a series of battles over all sorts of problems and each must be formulated in a revolutionary way.

> "From what Parabellum says, it appears that, in the name of the socialist revolution, he scornfully rejects a consistently revolutionary programme in the sphere of democracy. He is wrong to do so. The proletariat cannot be victorious except through democracy, i.e., by giving

full effect to democracy and by linking with each step of its struggle democratic demands formulated in the most resolute terms. It is absurd to contrapose the socialist revolution and the revolutionary struggle against capitalism to a single problem of democracy…We must combine the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with a revolutionary programme and tactics on all democratic demands: a republic, a militia, the popular election of officials, equal rights for women, the self-determination of nations, etc. While capitalism exists, these demands—all of them—can only be accomplished as an exception, and even then, in an incomplete and distorted form. Basing ourselves on the democracy already achieved, and exposing its incompleteness under capitalism, we demand the overthrow of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, as a necessary basis both for the abolition of the poverty of the masses and for the complete and all-round institution of all democratic reforms. Some of these reforms will be started before the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, others in the course of that overthrow, and still others after it. The social revolution is not a single battle, but a period covering a series of battles over all sorts of problems of economic and democratic reform, which are consummated only by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It is for the sake of this final aim that we must formulate every one of our democratic demands in a consistently revolutionary way. It is quite conceivable that the workers of some particular country will overthrow the bourgeoisie before even a single fundamental democratic reform has been fully achieved. It is, however, quite inconceivable that the proletariat, as a historical class, will be able to defeat the bourgeoisie, unless it is prepared for that by being

> educated in the spirit of the most consistent and resolutely revolutionary democracy." (6)

In regard to the phases of revolution, as contrast to the left child disease, such as "revolution now", "revolution tomorrow ", "revolution or nothing", Lenin points out that the revolution requires certain processes, and the strategy must be determined concretely depending on the assessment of concrete conditions in this process. His words; " It is not enough to learn slogans by heart; one must also learn to judge the opportune moment to issue them"* demonstrates the necessity of assessments to be made based on the concrete facts. (8)

Looking at the Russian history of revolution and Lenin's assessments, past and current history of the world, we can safely construe the fact that the bourgeoisie will never leave the power in a peaceful way, nor the revolution will be realized in one leap without any intermediate stages. Some may have to go through the toppling of autocracy, revolutionary democracy and socialist revolution, others may go through revolutionary democracy followed by socialist revolution.

Especially for the undeveloped, dependent countries, Stalin and Lenin stresses the necessity of a democratic republic as a stage and importance of using parliament as a means:

Stalin;

> "Political freedom is best achieved in a democratic republic, of course, and of course, in the conditions of capitalism. For this reason, all the advocates of proletarian socialism must strive to establish a democratic republic as the best "bridge" to socialism." (9)

Lenin;

> "How can one say that "parliamentarianism is politically obsolete", when "millions" and "legions" of proletarians are not only still in favour of parliamentarianism in general but are downright "counter-revolutionary"!?" (10)

This, however, does not mean that Marxists Leninists see a democratic republic as an alternate to socialism but as an alternate in backward, autocratic countries where the objective and subjective conditions do not exist and where the laboring masses needed to be educated in the spirit of revolutionary democracy. In advanced capitalist countries, however, granting the conditions exist, the only alternative is socialism through insurrection – in some more than others, depending on the revolutionary situation, a phase of "revolutionary democracy" may be required.

As for most existing "parliaments" - if not all-, the parliaments formed after the toppling of autocracy followed by an insurrection - unless lead by the ML and achieved the majority in it - will still be a "pigsty" of bourgeoisie.

As Lenin points out;

> "Only the armed people, organised in a revolutionary army" says Lenin, "which has won over to its side all decent and honest elements in the tsar's army, has overcome the tsar's forces and substituted a provisional revolutionary government for the tsar's autocratic government. .... The slogan for all this agitation will be: insurrection, the immediate formation of combat squads and contingents of a revolutionary army, the overthrow of tsarist rule, and the establishment of a provisional revolutionary government which is to convene a popular constituent assembly." (11)
>
> And Characterizing the Duma he states;

> "We have said that the State Duma is a mockery of popular representation. That is undoubtedly so from the standpoint of the theory of the sovereignty of the people.
>
> In present-day Russia we have before us three political theories of whose significance we shall yet speak on more than one occasion. These are: 1) The theory of the tsar's consultation with the people … 2) The theory of an agreement between the tsar and the people... 3) The theory of the sovereignty of the people (the programme of Social-Democracy, as well as of revolutionary democracy in general)." (11)

In simple terms based on any given country's concrete situation, if the majority of the masses still expects hope from the parliament, and they are at the same time counterrevolutionary, and where the autocracy reigns, efforts should be made at minimal to establish a "popular constituent assembly", if it exists, or the subjective conditions are ripe, all the democratic opportunities, including the parliament should be utilized for the establishment of a "Revolutionary Democracy" as a bridge to the socialist revolution or if both objective and subjective conditions exist, directly to socialist revolution. At any given moment, the minimal and maximal goals should be set, phases are determined, not based on subjective hopes, wishes and expectations with revolutionary phrases, but based on the concrete assessment of concrete situation.

Can "People's Democracy" that sees the elections and the parliamentary as the only path be realistic?

First question should be; Can a majority be held in parliament with elections? Considering, particularly the technological advances and current technology, and those who owns and

controls them, and their power in manipulating the minds, buying votes and other frauds in elections and imperialist interferences to the elections and election results; to make such an argument would be childish.

Even if the majority in the parliament could be achieved, is there a possibility of turning it into a socialist parliament, socialist power? Can there be exceptions? Of course, as history shown, there may be exceptions, such as, MLs can take over the majority in parliament as a result of a regional war or as a result of an uprising against fascism. Marxist Leninists do not deny that there may be exceptions. But let's not forget, Marxists do not set their strategy and tactics based on expectations and exceptions, but on general rules. The strategy of organizing and taking power on the basis of general principles -fitting the given country and situation- does not endanger the seizure of power and holding on to the power in case of an exception, on the contrary it facilitates.

As an example of constituent assembly achieved through uprising within which carries another uprising as a phase, Lenin states;

> "The Russian proletariat, however, is at present a minority of the population in Russia. It can become the great, overwhelming majority only if it combines with the mass of semi-proletarians, semi-proprietors, i.e., with the mass of the petty-bourgeois urban and rural poor. Such a composition of the social basis of the possible and desirable revolutionary-democratic dictatorship will, of course, affect the composition of the revolutionary government and inevitably lead to the participation, or even predominance, within it of the most heterogeneous representatives of revolutionary democracy. It would be extremely harmful to entertain any illusions on this score. If that windbag Trotsky now

> writes (unfortunately, side by side with Parvus) that "a Father Gapon could appear only once", that "there is no room for a second Gapon", he does so simply because he is a windbag. If there were no room in Russia for a second Gapon, there would be no room for a truly "great", consummated democratic revolution." (12)

As history has proven, in general, the majority in parliament can only be achieved in relation with an uprising, or multiple staged uprisings in different forms and levels in different countries, based on each specific condition.

The struggle for a revolutionary democracy and revolution can be waged through only legal means within the boundaries of the existing system is an illusion, a reformist deception.

While Lenin stresses the importance of legal work by saying "Don't let a single hour of legal work slip by", he warns not to sink into reformism;

> "The party of the working class, without abandoning legal activity but never for a moment overrating it, must combine legal with illegal work, as it did in 1912–14." (13)

Including the struggle for a constitutional democracy, struggle for a Revolutionary Democracy and socialist revolution cannot be waged legal means only, for its success depends on some kind of insurrection, at varying degree which fundamentally could be organized illegally.

Let us first examine these questions after giving a synopsis of the concept of insurrection and Revolution.

The difference between Insurrection and Revolution

Lenin sees the armed insurrection as a special form of political struggle.

"A people's revolution," says Lenin, "cannot be timed in advance. An uprising can be, if those preparing it have influence among the masses and can correctly estimate the situation..." (14)

This interdependent two concepts are being used as an equated manner in general and in Turkey particular. Consequently, the concepts of "Revolution" and "Strategy" always remain to be "abstract", vague, where neither the one who mentions and the one who hears can bring it down to a concrete footing in order to comprehend.

The uprising is a form of struggle and serves as a bridge that extends all the way to the realization of the Revolution. A revolution without uprising is unthinkable – always without denying the possibility of exceptions.

Democratic Struggle - Can there be a "People's Democracy", without an uprising?

If we look at the history, especially the recent historical events, it indicates that it is not possible to have a majority in parliament (for the revolutionary democracy) without the support of some kind of uprising.

When Lenin criticized the Bundists in 1905, he said,

> "The formation of a constituent assembly without the aid of an uprising is an idea worthy only of bourgeois philistines, as even the comrades of the Bund realize " (15)

In his short essay entitled "Political Situation," Lenin explains;

> "The aim of the insurrection can only be to transfer power to the proletariat, supported by the poor peasants, with a view to putting our Party programme into effect." (13)

An autocratic government can be toppled through an uprising or an election followed by an uprising, however that does not necessarily guarantee a majority in the parliament, or a “Revolutionary Democracy”.

Can the “People's Democracy” protect itself and be a bridge to Socialism without the uprising?

As Lenin emphasized above, parliament, as “People's Democracy” requires new legal and illegal organizations and activities to gain the majority, to protect, to consolidate and to ensure the transition bridge without interruption.

Just as an uprising would be the instrument of a parliament that would provide the majority of revolutionaries under the name of “popular power”, “Revolutionary Democracy”, the Revolutionary Parliament should be seen as a means of a new uprising to complete the bridge. In other words, the Power of "Revolutionary Democracy” - parliamentary bridge, form of struggle - cannot be seen as a final goal. From uprising to parliament, from parliament to (a new) uprising - the bridge should be seen as a continuous construction.

In evaluating the period in Russia, Lenin says,

> " A provisional revolutionary government is an organ of insurrection a provisional revolutionary government “emerging from a victorious popular insurrection”: both logic and historical experience show that it is possible to have provisional revolutionary governments as organs of insurrection which are far from victorious, or which are not completely victorious.” (15)

Lenin summarizes these words as: " a provisional revolutionary government does not only “emerge” from an uprising, but also directs it"

The history has proven that without the evaluation of the current concrete conditions, and on that basis determining concrete strategy, the abstract "revolution" and "revolution now" slogans have not served to the interests of revolutionary struggle, not served to put its foot on the ground. Unlike Trotsky's view (which will be dealt on separately) Revolution is not a military coup. It is very common these days to hear "Revolution Now", "Either now or never", "all or nothing" slogans from those who do not embrace and has no strong ties with the masses, and do nothing about it, yet spreading the vague illusion that the revolution will happen "spontaneously" or by some "supermen" from space in a miracle way. The fact is that not only revolution but insurrections that carry the movement to revolution requires the determined participation of masses and utilization of parliament at each stage -whether it be constituent or revolutionary democracy. As Lenin puts it;

> "" an uprising without the aid of a provisional revolutionary government can be neither an uprising of the whole people nor a victorious uprising. " (15)

In other words, insurrection is not only an important component of acquiring the power, but of safe-keeping and carrying it to the socialist revolution. And insurrection means masses.

Uprising conditions and preparation

Lenin, who speaks about the necessity of the revolutionaries to assess the conditions of struggle, examine the new forms of struggle, their practical validity, and the possibility of realization, and followed by the education of the masses on this basis, says;

> " If it is necessary to prepare for an uprising, such preparation must of necessity include the dissemination and explanation of slogans calling for an armed

> uprising of the people, the formation of a revolutionary army, and the establishment of a provisional revolutionary government." (15)

On the one hand, "Spontaneity -ist", for example In Turkey, and those who see the masses as "flock" that will tail the "heroes" on the other, promote abstract insurrection and revolution slogans and yet still lack the practice. Despite such catchy far-left slogans what actually promoted is passivity, submissive, hopeless, defeatist, and self-destructive practices – which in return reflects on the masses as such and strengthens the parliamentary illusion. Such abstract slogans not reflecting the existing conditions deepens the isolation of revolutionary movements from the masses of people.

In his letter to the Central Committee of Lenin summarizes the three conditions of the insurrection:

> " To be successful, insurrection must rely not upon conspiracy and not upon a party, but upon the advanced class. That is the first point. Insurrection must rely upon a revolutionary upsurge of the people. That is the second point. Insurrection must rely upon that turning-point in the history of the growing revolution when the activity of the advanced ranks of the people is at its height, and when the vacillations in the ranks of the enemy and in the ranks of the weak, half-hearted, and irresolute friends of the revolution are strongest. That is the third point. And these three conditions for raising the question of insurrection distinguish Marxism from Blanquism. " (16)

Lenin based on the given concrete conditions draws attention to two important points in the preparation of the Uprising;

> “Firstly, the task of preparing an uprising must carry within it the pre- emergence of the uprising that is being prepared or almost prepared.
>
> "Secondly, that the uprising now developing spontaneously is outstripping the purposeful and planned work we are doing to prepare it. We are unable now to restrain the insurrectionary outbreaks which occur here and there sporadically, disconnectedly, and spontaneously. So much the more are we in duty bound to speed up dissemination and explanation of all the political tasks and political requisites of a successful uprising.” (15)
>
> It is clear that, the uprising and revolution cannot be put in practice with abstract, far-left-phrase making, and by movements isolated from the masses. On the contrary, it requires the determination of strategies on the basis of research and analysis. It carries a responsibility to the public; it is not a matter of gambling with the interests of the working people and their struggle with "abstract" slogans that has no feet in the ground. As Lenin puts it;
>
> "We Marxists have always been proud that we determined the expediency of any form of struggle by a precise calculation of the mass forces and class relationships. We have said that an insurrection is not always expedient; unless the prerequisites exist among the masses, it is a gamble " (17)

In the current conditions of autocracy in Turkey, for example, in respect to some of the objective conditions for the uprising the answer to the question would be "Yes" , however the concrete reality of unorganized masses and lack of a strong, uniting, united leadership, for the subjective conditions the answer will be "No". In fact, some of the conditions that make

up the objective conditions in favor, reveal the political tasks for the unfavourable subjective conditions as urgent tasks in order to change it into favorable. The "Form" or "Name "is not decisive. A "Coalition", "Front", "Alliance" etc., any front formed on the basis of the "bridge" concept, can take up the historical responsibility and the task of developing the spontaneous upswings into a power of uprising. Bringing forward only the argument that the "elections will not bring any changes "and remaining passive will not change the subjective conditions favorably, visible practice and trials of building an active revolutionary-front will. As Lenin puts it;

> "Our job is to promote the democratic upswing, to foster the new revolutionary democracy that is growing in a new way in the new Russia. Unless it succeeds in gathering strength and winning in spite of the liberals, no "triumph" of the Progressists and the Cadets in the elections will bring about any serious change in the actual situation in Russia.....Our task is to organise the revolutionary democrats... intensify our revolutionary Social-Democratic work among the proletariat and strengthen the illegal Social-Democratic Labour Party." (18)

One cannot compare and copy the "alliance" forms of a country where a strong vanguard leadership exists and apply to a country where there is not. Objective and subjective conditions vary in each given country, so the makeup of the "alliances" vary.

Concrete Conditions and Possible Alliances

Based on each objective and subjective concrete situation, each minimal, urgent aim will have varying alliances. There may be a situation where it can quickly and uninterruptedly transfer from the minimal to maximum, as there can be situation of a

transfer from minimal to an intermediary phase. There is no one template that fits every country and every situation, each is determined by the conditions of its own particular - of course in connection with general.

Regardless of the type of alliances at any given condition, Stalin points out one important factor that is related to the importance of democratic tasks which is crucial for the success of any revolution. He says" the question of the middle strata is undoubtedly one of the basic questions of the workers' revolution. The middle strata are the peasantry and the small urban working people. The oppressed nationalities, nine-tenths of whom consist of middle strata, should also be put in this category. As you see, these are the strata whose economic status puts them midway between the proletariat and the capitalist class. The relative importance of these strata is determined by two circumstances: firstly, these strata constitute the majority, or, at any rate, a large minority of the population of the existing states; secondly, they constitute the important reserves from which the capitalist class recruits its army against the proletariat. The proletariat cannot retain power unless it enjoys the sympathy and support of the middle strata, primarily of the peasantry, especially in a country like our Union of Republics. The proletariat cannot even seriously contemplate seizing power if these strata have not been at least neutralized, if they have not yet managed to break away from the capitalist class, and if the bulk of them still serve as the army of capital." Stalin, The October Revolution, and the Question of the Middle Strata

Never forgetting Stalin's assessment, let's give a synopsis of typical alliances at different conditions based on Lenin's assessments.

1- Alliances against Autocratic, fascists systems

Alliance against autocratic systems will be in varying character and inevitably embrace the widest strata of classes.

Example of Turkey in particular, currently experiencing a period of unprecedented historical monopolization. Concerning the concrete situation, the alliances and the "benefiting from the contradictions within bourgeoisie, Lenin's assessment of the autocracy is important to mention;

> "" the autocracy guarantees the bourgeoisie opportunities to employ the crudest forms of exploitation, but, on the other hand, places a thousand obstacles in the way of the extensive development of the productive forces and the spread of education; in this way it arouses against itself, not only the petty bourgeoisie, but at times even the big bourgeoisie." (19)

In relation with the "conditions of uprising", under the autocracy the discontent and opposition widen and reaches its peak in its maturation. Marxist Leninists cannot ignore and remain indifferent to this discontent and opposition with far-left phrase making with abstract "class point of view" that contradicts ML and makes them indifferent to the discontent among the masses.

In reference to autocracy, the opposition that the system will create and the attitude of the revolutionaries against it, Lenin summarizes the following in terms of "class perspective";

> " The autocracy guarantees (?) the bourgeoisie protection against socialism, but since the people are deprived of rights, this protection is necessarily transformed into a system of police outrages that rouse the indignation of the entire people. .....It is precisely the "class point of view" that makes it impermissible for a Social-Democrat to remain indifferent to the discontent and the protests. " (19)

The example of Autocracy in Turkey, in addition to the discontent and "hate of autocracy" turning into sporadic active practice, the discontent and hate in the large peasantry population -which is the most important alliance of revolution – is increasing. All these discontents always have the possibility of spontaneously transforming into upswings and even into sporadic uprisings in different dimensions.

We always come across the far-left phrase mongering that labels every opposition to the autocracy as “reformist” and repeats the learned by rote slogan of “preserving the independence of the proletariat ", and ultimately chooses the pacifist" approach of doing nothing other than throwing slogans. Such phrase mongering approach that disregards the existing objective and subjective conditions has no practical connection with Marxism, Leninism. Lenin clearly notes;

> "It is particularly in regard to the political struggle that the “class point of view” demands that the proletariat give an impetus to every democratic movement. The political demands of working-class democracy do not differ in principle from those of bourgeois democracy, they differ only in degree. In the struggle for economic emancipation, for the socialist revolution, the proletariat stands on a basis different in principle and it stands alone (the small producer will come to its aid only to the extent that he enters, or is preparing to enter, its ranks). In the struggle for political liberation, however, we have many allies, towards whom we must not remain indifferent."(19)

As far as our subject is concerned, for the tasks of the Russian socialists working class of Lenin states that “ in the democratic, political struggle working class is not alone; all the elements of political opposition, its layers, and classes, stand beside it, as they are enemies of absolutism and wage struggle against it in

one way or another. Here side by side with the proletariat stand the opposition elements of the bourgeoisie, or of the educated classes, or of the petty bourgeoisie, or of the nationalities, religions, and sects, etc., etc., persecuted by the autocratic government." And he asks the question;

> "" The question naturally arises of what the attitude of the working class towards these elements should be. "(20)

He responds;

> "The attitude of the working class, as a fighter against the autocracy, towards all the other social classes and groups in the political opposition is very precisely determined by the basic principles of Social-Democracy expounded in the famous Communist Manifesto. The Social-Democrats support the progressive social classes against the reactionary classes, the bourgeoisie against the representatives of privileged landowning estate and the bureaucracy, the big bourgeoisie against the reactionary strivings of the petty bourgeoisie. This support does not presuppose, nor does it call for, any compromise with non-Social-Democratic programmes and principles—it is support given to an ally against a particular enemy." (20)

As a historical example, Stalin says;" The first wave of the Russian revolution began as a struggle against tsarism. The workers and soldiers were at that time the main forces of the revolution. But they were not the only forces. Besides them, bourgeois liberals (Cadets) and the British and French capitalists were also "active, … There thus arose something in the nature of a concealed coalition, under whose pressure tsarism was compelled to quit the stage. On the day following the fall of tsarism, the secret coalition became an open one,

having assumed the form of a definite agreement between the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet, between the Cadets and the "revolutionary democracy." But these forces pursued entirely different aims." (21)

Lenin explains who belongs to the camp of "Revolutionary Democracy" who does not;

> "Next come the "Trudoviks". The parties of this type, namely the petty-bourgeois and predominantly peasant parties, are divided into the non-party "Trudovik Group", the Popular Socialists and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. The only more or less consistent and determined revolutionaries and republicans among them are the S.-R.'s. The Popular Socialists are much worse opportunists than our Mensheviks; strictly speaking, they are semi-Cadets. The non-party "Trudovik Group" has, perhaps, more influence among the peasantry than the others; but the strength of its democratic convictions is difficult to determine, although it is undoubtedly far more Left than the Cadets, and evidently belongs to the camp of revolutionary democracy." (22)

Struggle against autocracy does not bring about a "Revolutionary Democracy "unless the subjective conditions exist and working class has the leadership, or majority in the leadership. Lenin states;

> "" we have made the revolution, after all, we are a revolutionary people, a revolutionary democracy... What revolution did we make? We overthrew Nicholas. ... Who did the revolution put in power? The landowners and capitalists the very same classes who have long been in power in Europe... A bank remains a

> bank, profits remain profits, be it in a republic or in a monarchy." (23)

And explains it in relation with the unique historical circumstances;

> "A revolutionary-democratic dictatorship has been established but not in the form we envisaged: it is interlocked with the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie… It is this unique historical concurrence of circumstances that has brought about a dual dictatorship: the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of revolutionary democracy. …voluntary submission of revolutionary democracy to the bourgeois dictatorship. The specific feature of the present situation is that lack of political awareness on the part of the masses is preventing the establishment of a stable and conscious majority on the side of the proletarian policy.. the separation of the proletarians and the semi proletarians from the petty bourgeoisie is inevitable, but the consolidation of the propertied elements in the revolutionary bloc may well advance to a point where it will prevail over the organisation of the masses rallying round the proletarian slogans. It is quite possible, therefore, that power will remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and that there will be no transfer of power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The conclusion: we are not faced with the task of overthrowing the Provisional Government—it rests on the confidence of the petty-bourgeois and a section of the workers' masses—but with that of painstaking explanation of the class tasks and organisation." (24)

Lenin gives another example in his evaluation of China;

The Chinese people have succeeded in overthrowing the old medieval system and the government supporting it. A republic has been established in China, and the first parliament of that great Asian country, which had long gladdened the hearts of the reactionaries of all nationalities by its immobility and stagnation—the first Chinese Parliament has been elected, convened and has been sitting for several weeks.

In the Lower of the two chambers of the Chinese Parliament, a small majority belongs to the supporters of Sun Yat-sen, the Kuomintang Party, the "Nationalists"—to express this party's essence in the context of Russian conditions, it should be called a radical-Narodnik republican party; a party of democracy. In the Upper Chamber it has a more considerable majority.

This party is opposed by smaller moderate or conservative parties with all sorts of names like "Radicals", and so on. Actually, all these parties are parties of reactionaries, namely, bureaucrats, landowners, and reactionary bourgeoisie. They all gravitate to the Chinese Cadet Y"uan Shih-k'ai, the provisional President of the Republic, who has been acting more and more like a dictator. As a Cadet he has been running true to form: yesterday he was a monarchist; now that revolutionary democracy has won out, he is a republican; tomorrow he intends to be the head of state, again a monarchist state, that is, to betray the Republic.

What is this party's weakness? It lies in the fact that it has not yet been able sufficiently to involve broad masses of the Chinese people in the revolution. The

proletariat in China is still very weak—there is therefore no leading class capable of waging a resolute and conscious struggle to carry the democratic revolution to its end. The peasantry, lacking a leader in the person of the proletariat, is terribly downtrodden, passive, ignorant and indifferent to politics. Despite the revolutionary overthrow of the old and thoroughly corrupt monarchy, despite the victory of the republic, China has no universal suffrage! The elections to Parliament had a qualification: only those who had property valued at about 500 rubles were entitled to vote! This also shows how little of the really broad popular mass has yet been drawn into active support of the Chinese Republic. But without such massive support, without an organised and steadfast leading class, the Republic cannot be stable.

Still, despite its leader Sun Yat-sen's major shortcomings (pensiveness and indecision, which are due to his lack of proletarian support), revolutionary democracy in China has done a great deal to awaken the people and to win freedom and consistently democratic institutions. By drawing ever broader masses of the Chinese peasantry into the movement and into politics, Sun Yat-sen's party is becoming (to the extent to Which this process is taking place) a great factor of progress in Asia and of mankind's progress. Whatever defeats it may suffer from political rogues, adventurers, and dictators, who rely on the country's reactionary forces, this party's efforts will not have been in vain." (P423)

"The chief representative, or the chief social bulwark, of this Asian bourgeoisie that is still capable of supporting a historically progressive cause, is the peasant. And side by side with him there already exists a liberal

> bourgeoisie whose leaders, men like Yuan Shih-kai, are above all capable of treachery: yesterday they feared the emperor, and cringed before him; then they betrayed him when they saw the strength, and sensed the victory, of the revolutionary democracy; and tomorrow they will betray the democrats to make a deal with some old or new "constitutional" emperor." (25)

Struggle waged against the autocratic systems mostly covers the minimal, democratic tasks of socialist revolution, and thus will have varying alliances, especially the peasantry.

2- Alliances for "Revolutionary Democracy"

Alliances aiming for Revolutionary democracy, however, consists only the alliance with the revolutionary democrats - contingent upon the existence of a strong vanguard party.

Lenin explains as following;

> "The first stage. The Social-Democrats make the theoretical preparations for the elections. The most prominent representatives of the Right and the Left wings express their views.... The Bolsheviks come out in favour of a purely Social-Democratic election list, but do not exclude agreements with the revolutionary democrats." (26)

Characterizing the liberal party:

> "The Tiflis Mensheviks, it turns out, do not know that universal suffrage is not a Cadet demand, but the demand of revolutionary democracy, which Social-Democracy advocates more consistently than anyone else! No, comrades, … the Cadets are not revolutionary democrats." (27)

> "No, it is not we who are refusing to fight against the 'pseudo-socialist nature of the Narodniks, but you Menshevik comrades, who have refused to support revolutionary democracy, and prefer the liberals (the Cadets). "(28)

Assessing the objective conditions and comparing with the previous;

> "At one time Russian Social-Democracy consisted of a handful of members. At that time, it bore the character of a movement of intellectuals and was unable to influence the proletarian struggle. Party policy was then directed by one or two individuals—the voice of the proletarian membership of the party was drowned. . . . The situation is entirely different today. Today we have a magnificent party—the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, which has as many as 200,000 members in its ranks, which is influencing the proletarian struggle, is rallying around itself the revolutionary democracy of the whole of Russia and is a terror to "the powers that be." (29)

And defining the aim and comparing with the previous;

> "What is the real task facing Russia? The complete replacement of semi-feudal economy by "civilised capitalism".
>
> That is not Marxism, however, but Struveism or liberalism, for a Marxist distinguishes between classes with their Octobrist, Cadet, Trudovik, or proletarian ideas as to what constitutes "civilised" capitalism.
>
> What is the crux of the problem of appraising of the revolution? …. The essence of the question is: which of the classes that took part in the revolution showed that

they were capable of waging a direct, mass revolutionary struggle, which classes betrayed the revolution and directly or indirectly joined the counter-revolution? Rkov concealed this essence and was thus able to ignore the difference between revolutionary democracy and the liberal-monarchist "progressive" opposition." (30)

We Social-Democrats regard a "victory" of the Progressists as an indirect expression of a democratic upswing. It is necessary to use the skirmishes between the Progressists and the Rights—the mere slogan of support for the Progressists is no good. Our job is to promote the democratic upswing, to foster the new revolutionary democracy that is growing in a new way in the new Russia. Unless it succeeds in gathering strength and winning in spite of the liberals, no "triumph" of the Progressists and the Cadets in the elections will bring about any serious change in the actual situation in Russia.

The democratic upswing is an indisputable fact now. It is progressing with greater difficulty, at a slower pace and along a more arduous path than we should like, but it is progressing, nonetheless. It is this that we must "support" and promote by our election work and every other kind of activity. Our task is to organise the revolutionary democrats—by ruthless criticism of Narodnik liquidationism and Narodnik otzovism to forge a republican peasant party—but first of all and above all else to clean "our own house" of liquidationism and otzovism, intensify our revolutionary Social-Democratic work among the proletariat and strengthen the illegal Social-Democratic Labour Party. The outcome of the growing

revolutionary crisis does not depend on us; it depends on a thousand different causes, on the revolution in Asia and on socialism in Europe. But it does depend on us to conduct consistent and steady work among the masses in the spirit of Marxism, and only this kind of work is never done in vain." (18)

" If the Cadets are now playing at "eyes left", as the Octobrists taunt them, that is one of the symptoms and one of the results of the country moving "leftward"; it shows that revolutionary democracy is stirring in the womb of its mother, preparing to come into God's world again. The womb of Russia under the rule of the Purishkeviches and Romanovs is such that it must give birth to revolutionary democracy!"

Setting the tasks and tactics;

"What is the practical conclusion to be drawn from this? The conclusion is that we must watch the growth of this new revolutionary democracy with the greatest attention. Just because it is new, because it is coming into the world after 1905 and after the counter-revolution, and not before it, it is sure to grow in a new way; and in order to be able properly to approach this "new", to be able to influence it and help it grow successfully, we must not confine ourselves to the old methods, but must search for new methods as well—we must mingle with the crowds, feel the pulse of real life, and sometimes make our way not only into the thick of the crowd, but also into the liberal salon." (31)

"The liberal opposition and revolutionary democracy (Social-Democratic workers and peasant bourgeois democrats) have almost managed to retain the status quo." (32)

> "Through its resolution the Conference unconsciously descends to the level of the liberal and monarchist bourgeoisie. The Party Congress in its resolution consciously raises to its own level those elements of the revolutionary democracy that are capable of waging a struggle and not of acting as brokers.
>
> Such elements are mostly to be found among the peasants. In classifying the big social groups according to their political tendencies, we can, without danger of serious error, identify revolutionary and republican democracy with the mass of the peasants." (33)

And stresses "the necessity of the proletariat's support for revolutionary democracy." (34)

> "Revolutionary democracy, i.e., in the main, the proletariat, and Social-Democracy, the vehicle of its conscious expression, is, by and large, fully in favour of insurrection." (35)

These (preceding) conditions determine also the militant agreement between Social-Democracy and revolutionary democracy for the insurrection.

> (h) By revolutionary democracy is meant the consistent and firm democratic currents that accept the whole democratic programme of Social-Democracy, do not hold back from any revolutionary measures, but lack the clear Social-Democratic class consciousness .....On the order of the day an agreement not on the condition of declarations, but on the condition of participation in the uprising, not with the liberal democrats, but with the revolutionary democrats." (36)
>
> The Editorial Board of Vperyod proposes to the Congress the following tentative agenda: 1)

> Constitution of the Congress (standing orders, report of the Organising Committee, examination of credentials). 2) Delegates' reports. 3) The Party crisis. 4) Organizational question. 5) Attitude towards insurrection. 6) Agreement with the revolutionary democrats for purposes of the insurrection. 7) Attitude towards the liberals.(8) Work among the peasantry and support of the revolutionary peasant movement. 9) Work among the troops. 10) Improvement of propaganda and agitation. 11) election of officers." (37)

Lenin's approach to the subject of reconciliation is, in fact, finds itself in his following words; " The conclusion is clear: to reject compromises "on principle", to reject the permissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to consider seriously… One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each variety of compromise." (38)

Lenin clearly states that those who do not understand this reveal a failure to understand even the smallest grain of Marxism, of modern scientific socialism in general;

> "The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and by the most thorough, careful, attentive, skillful and obligatory use of any, even the smallest, rift between the enemies, any conflict of interests among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of any, even the smallest, opportunity of winning a mass ally, even though this ally is temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this reveal a

> failure to understand even the smallest grain of Marxism, of modern scientific socialism in general." (38)

Forming practical alliances directed to the achievement of any given aim is subject to the existing conditions and analysis of class relations, balances of power at that given moment. For revolutionary democracy "Our ideal is" says Lenin" purely Social-Democratic committees in all rural districts, and then agreement between them and all revolutionary-democratic elements, groups, and circles of the peasantry for the purpose of establishing revolutionary committees. There is a perfect analogy here to the independence of the Social-Democratic Labour Party in the towns and its alliance with all the revolutionary democrats for the purpose of insurrection. We are in favour of a peasant uprising. We are absolutely opposed to the mixing and merging of heterogeneous class elements and heterogeneous parties. We hold that for the purpose of insurrection Social-Democracy should give an impetus to all revolutionary democracy, should help it all to organise, should march shoulder to shoulder with it, but without merging with it, to the barricades in the cities, and against the landlords and the police in the villages. Long live the insurrection in town and country against the autocracy! Long live revolutionary Social-Democracy, the vanguard of all revolutionary democracy in the present revolution! " (39)

> "The union of the proletariat and revolutionary democracy, which we have spoken of on more than one occasion, is becoming a fact. The radical students, who both in St. Petersburg and in Moscow adopted the slogans of revolutionary Social-Democracy, are the vanguard of all the democratic forces. Loathing the baseness of the "Constitutional Democratic" reformists who have accepted the State Duma, these forces gravitate towards a real and decisive struggle against

the accursed enemy of the Russian people rather than towards a policy of bargaining with the autocracy." (40)

"As regards Party divisions, it is natural that members of the same Party will prefer to belong to the same group. But there should be no hard and fast rule debarring members of other parties from joining. It is precisely here that we must put into practice the alliance, the working agreement (without any merging of parties, of course), between the socialist proletariat and revolutionary democracy. Whoever wants to fight for liberty and proves in fact his readiness to do so may be regarded as a revolutionary democrat, and we must strive to carry on with such people the work of preparing for the uprising (provided, of course, the given person or group is quite trustworthy). All other "democrats" should be emphatically rejected as quasi-democrats, as liberal windbags who must not be relied on at all, and whom it would be criminal for a revolutionary to trust." (41)

In countries where an oppressed minority people exist, either the aim of the struggle is democratic; toppling the Autocracy, or "revolutionary democracy" as a bridge to socialist revolution, alliance will have to contain in it the revolutionary democrats of minority people. Therefore, the insurrection propaganda and activities constitute another important element. Lenin, who reminds that the socialist support every revolutionary movements says; " Those words are often interpreted too narrowly and are not taken to imply support for the liberal opposition. It must not be forgotten, however, that there are periods when every conflict with the government arising out of progressive social interests, however small, may under certain conditions (of which our support is one) flare up into a general conflagration." (19)

The issue of the alliance will be of different quality and content in the uprising in the path of democracy, from the alliance of Revolutionary Democracy as a bridge to socialist revolution. It would be a childish dream to think that the allies, especially the bourgeois, will not cross the ranks on the path of Revolutionary Democracy. At this point, in order to remain in power and to be able to carry out the transition, it is important to note following words of Lenin in order to understand and make the dialectic connection;

> "While pointing to the solidarity of one or other of the various opposition groups with the workers, the Social-Democrats will always single out the workers from the rest, they will always point out that this solidarity is temporary and conditional, they will always emphasise the independent class identity of the proletariat, who tomorrow may find themselves in opposition to their allies of today." (20)

Criticizing Axelrod's pamphlet for not singling out the revolutionary democrats, Lenin says "In connection with P. B. Axelrod's little pamphlet entitled The People's Duma and a Workers' Congress, the following should be noted:.....Complete inability to single out revolutionary democracy and indicate concrete slogans on a political agreement with the latter." (42)

The class content of alliance determines the class nature of a "democracy". "the resolution should express this idea clearly instead of being so vague about it. "says Lenin" because the resolution reflects the fundamental error of the new Iskra, which is unable to distinguish between revolutionary democracy and liberal-monarchist democracy." (43)

3- Overall comparison of alliances in different phases

Each phase inevitably will have different aims based on the existing conditions, and thus will have different alliances and supporters. War times, struggle against autocracy, struggle for democratic rights, for revolutionary democracy and for socialist revolution, each has different minimal aim subordinated to maximal aim with different alliances.

'In our opinion, to ease the incredible burdens and miseries of the war and also to heal the terrible wounds the war has inflicted on the people, revolutionary democracy is needed… We alone can create such an apparatus because we have class-conscious workers disciplined by long capitalist "schooling", workers who are capable of forming a workers' militia and of gradually expanding it into a militia embracing the whole people. The class-conscious workers must lead, but for the work of administration they can enlist the vast mass of the working and oppressed people." (44)

"The present, the period of a democratic revolution, bourgeois in its social and economic content, is a time when bourgeois democrats, all Constitutional-Democrats, etc., right down to the Socialist-Revolutionaries, are revealing a particular inclination to advocate "comprehensive democratic organisations" and in general to encourage, directly or indirectly, overtly, or covertly, non-partisanship, i.e., an absence of any strict division between the democrats. Class-conscious representatives of the proletariat must fight this tendency resolutely and ruthlessly, for it is profoundly bourgeois in essence. We must bring exact party distinctions into the fore ground, expose all confusion, show up the falsity of phrases about allegedly united, broad, solid democratism, phrases our liberal newspapers are teeming with. In proposing an alliance with certain sections of the democrats for the achievement of definite tasks, we should single out only revolutionary democrats—particularly at a time like this; we should indicate what most clearly distinguishes

those "prepared" to fight (right now, in the ranks of the revolutionary army) from those who are "prepared" to bargain with the autocracy." (43)

"We must bend every effort to rouse, in addition to the students, who are the vanguard of revolutionary democracy, also those broad masses of the people whose movement is not only democratic in a general way (today every turncoat calls himself a democrat), but a genuinely revolutionary movement—namely, the masses of the peasantry." (45)

The ranks of revolutionary democracy have been reinforced by a new organisation, which, of course, shares a good many of the illusions that are characteristic of the small producer, but which in the present revolution undoubtedly expresses the trend toward a ruthless mass struggle against Asiatic despotism and feudal landlordism." (46)

"In publishing this draft resolution, we invite the impartial reader to say whether this draft provides any excuse for playing with words like "anarchism", "Blanquism", etc. Furthermore, which resolution has been justified by experience: the one adopted by the Congress, or this one? Is it not clear now that none but indirect use can be made of the Duma? Is it not clear now which of these two resolutions more directly meets genuine revolutionary democracy, and more correctly appraises "Cadetism" as it has manifested itself in practice, in the Duma?" (47)

The proletariat often hears the bourgeoisie say nowadays: you must march together with the bourgeois democrats. Without their aid the proletariat will be unable to carry out a revolution. That is true. But the question is: with which democrats can and should the proletariat march now? With the Cadet democrats, or the peasant revolutionary democrats? There can be only one answer to this question: not with the Cadet democrats, but with

the revolutionary democrats; not with the liberals, but with the masses of the peasantry.

Bearing this reply in mind, we must not lose sight of the fact that the more rapidly the peasants become enlightened and the more openly they act in politics, the more markedly do all revolutionary elements among the bourgeois democrats gravitate towards the peasantry and, of course, also towards the petty-bourgeois townsfolk. Minor distinctions become unimportant. What comes to the fore front is the primary question: are the various parties, groups and organisations going all the way with the revolutionary peasantry? More and more clearly, we see the Socialist-Revolutionaries, certain independent socialists, the most Left of the radicals and a number of peasants organisations merging politically into one revolutionary democracy." (48)

4- Alliances of socialist revolution

Working class is alone when it comes to the socialist revolution. It is made up of proletarian and semi-proletarian masses lead by its vanguard communist party. However, unless both objective and subjective conditions for socialist revolution is ripe and sympathy and support of the middle strata has been gained over or at least neutralized, socialist revolution will have to go through some phases with different alliances. All phases are a part and particular of socialist revolution, only at the final phase the alliance proletariat stands alone. The difference in the use of slogans "Soviet (to) Power" and "All power to the Soviets explains the difference and also marks the class essence of alliances in both. Lenin explains this in different writings clearly.

For one phase of socialist revolution he states;

> "We are for a strong revolutionary government. Whatever the capitalists and their flunkeys may shout about us to the contrary, their lies will remain lies.
>
> The thing is not to let phrases obscure one's consciousness, disorient one's mind. When people speak about "revolution", "the revolutionary people", "revolutionary democracy", and so on, nine times out of ten this is a lie or self-deception. The question is—what class is making this revolution? A revolution against whom?
>
> "Against tsarism? In that sense most of Russia's landowners and capitalists today are revolutionaries. When the revolution is an accomplished fact, even reactionaries come into line with it. There is no deception of the masses at present more frequent, more detestable, and more harmful than that which lauds the revolution against tsarism." (49)

"true democracy consists in imitating the way in which "revolutionary democracy" has composed its "new" government, where the workers and peasants are "represented" by six Mensheviks and Narodniks while eight Cadets and Octobrists represent the landowners and the capitalists…. the majority of Russia's population belongs to the class of landowners and capitalists?" (50) "The line of the petty bourgeoisie must be separated from that of the wage-earning proletariat." Such "Revolutionary democracy is no good at all; it is a mere phrase. It covers up rather than lays bare the antagonisms of class interests. A Bolshevik must open the eyes of the workers and peasants to the existence of these antagonisms, not gloss them over… The real work is to bring about the abolition of the standing army, the bureaucracy, and the police, and to arm the whole people." (24) "The trouble is that it has become a "custom" "nowadays", under the cover of

high-sounding phrases about 'revolutionary democracy", to accept democratic (the more so socialist) programmes "in principle" but reject them in practice." (51)

Differentiation the role and the aim of Revolutionary Democracy Lenin states; "The pseudo-Marxist lackeys of the bourgeoisie, who have been joined by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and who argue in this way, do not understand (as an examination of the theoretical basis of their opinion shows) what imperialism is, what capitalist monopoly is, what the state is, and what revolutionary democracy is. For anyone who understands this is bound to admit that there can be no advance except towards socialism.

If it has become a state monopoly, it means that the state (i.e., the armed organisation of the population, the workers, and peasants above all, provided there is revolutionary democracy) directs the whole undertaking. In whose interest?

Either in the interest of the landowners and capitalists, in which case we have not a revolutionary-democratic, but a reactionary-bureaucratic state, an imperialist republic.

Or in the interest of revolutionary democracy—and then it is a step towards socialism.

Either we have to be revolutionary democrats in fact, in which case we must not fear to take steps towards socialism. Or we fear to take steps towards socialism, condemn them in the Plekhanov, Dan or Chernov way, by arguing that our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, that socialism cannot be "introduced", etc., in which case we inevitably sink to the level of Kerensky, Milyukov and Kornilov, i.e., we in a reactionary-bureaucratic way suppress the "revolutionary-democratic" aspirations of the workers and peasants." There is no middle course." (52)

"Comrade Aviloy, throughout his resolution, in all its concrete substance and all its practical proposals, forgets the class standpoint, and, like the Mensheviks and Narodniks, lapses into bombast about the "state" in general, about "revolutionary democracy" in the abstract.

How can a Marxist forget that in the history of all countries the capitalists, too, have often been "revolutionary democrats", as in England in 1649, in France in 1789, in 1830, 1848, and 1870, and in Russia in February 1917?

Can you have forgotten that the revolutionary democracy of the capitalists, of the petty bourgeoisie and of the proletariat must be distinguished one from the other? Does not the whole history of all the revolutions I have just mentioned show a distinction of classes within "revolutionary democracy"?

The April crisis (April 20), followed by that of May 6, then May 27–29 (the elections), etc., etc., have brought about a definite cleavage of classes in the Russian revolution within the Russian "revolutionary democracy". To ignore this is to sink to the helpless level of the petty bourgeois.

To appeal now to the "state" and to "revolutionary democracy" on the matter of predatory capitalism of all questions, is to drag the working class backward. In effect it means preaching complete stoppage of the revolution." (53)

"The counter-revolution has won, for the so-called "revolutionary democracy" has been placed at its disposal as a convenient shield against the anger of the people.

The counterrevolutionaries are now not alone. The whole "revolutionary democracy" is working for them. Now they have at their disposal the "public opinion" of the "land of Russia," which the defencist gentry will "assiduously" mould.

Coronation of counter-evolution—that is the outcome of the Moscow Conference." (54)

The importance of class essence of any revolution is that it determines the class essence of "democracy "achieved. Yet, not to minimize the importance of a provisional government Lenin states;

> "" an uprising without the aid of a provisional revolutionary government can be neither an uprising of the whole people nor a victorious uprising. " (15)

n his short essay entitled "Political Situation," Lenin explains that "The aim of the insurrection can only be to transfer power to the proletariat, supported by the poor peasants, with a view to putting our Party programme into effect." (13)

"As soon as they began to form the Soviets, the workers instinctively took up a firm class stand by the very act of establishing them. The Mensheviks and S.R.s, on the other hand, vacillated all the time. And when in the spring and summer of 1917 their own friends labelled them semi-Bolsheviks, this was a true description, not merely a witticism. On every single issue they would say "yes" one day and "no" the next, whether it was the question of the Soviets, the revolutionary movement in the countryside, the direct seizure of land, fraternization at the front, or whether to support imperialism. They would help on the one hand, and hinder on the other, all the time displaying their spinelessness and helplessness. Yet their propaganda among the people for the Soviets, which they always referred to as revolutionary democracy and contrasted with what they called the propertied elements, was only a cunning political device on their part, and the masses whom they addressed were carried away by this propaganda. Thus, the Menshevik preaching was partly of service to us too.

This is a very complex question with a wealth of history behind it. I need only dwell on it briefly. This policy of the Mensheviks and S.R.s before our very eyes is conclusive proof of our assertion that it is wrong to regard them as socialists. If they had at any time been socialists, it was only in their phraseology and reminiscences; in fact, they are nothing but Russian petty bourgeois.

I began with the attitude Marxists should adopt towards the middle peasant, or, in other words, towards the petty bourgeois parties. We are now coming to a stage when our slogans of the previous period of the revolution must be changed to take proper account of the present turn of events. You know that in October and November these people wavered.

The Bolshevik Party stood firm then and rightly so. We said we should have to destroy the enemies of the proletariat and were facing a battle on the fundamental issues of war or peace, of bourgeois representation, and of Soviet government. In all these questions we only had our own forces to rely on, and we were absolutely right when we refused to compromise with the petty-bourgeois democrats." (55)

"the Soviets represent revolutionary democracy insofar as they are joined by those who wish to fight in a revolutionary way. Their doors are not closed to members of the co-operatives and city dwellers. Those same Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks ran the Soviets.

Those who remained only in the co-operatives, who confined themselves only to municipal (city and Zemstvo) work, voluntarily separated themselves from the ranks of revolutionary democracy, thereby attaching themselves to a democracy that was either reactionary or neutral. Everybody knows that co-operative and municipal work is done not only by revolutionaries, but also by reactionaries; everybody knows

that people are elected to co-operatives and municipalities primarily for work that is not of general political scope and importance. "(56)

Conclusion

The use of terms should not be in their literal meaning, but in its historical context and historical, Marxist Leninist theorical use of the terms. Historically, the concept of "People's Democracy" refers to an exceptional form of "proletarian dictatorship" experienced in Eastern Europe. The use of "People's Democracy" for the countries that has completed or in the process of completing the bourgeois democratic revolutions differs in class context. In order to make the distinction in class context, "the use of "Revolutionary Democracy" is more suitable.

History has proven that socialist revolution -with some exceptions - cannot be achieved in one leap. It has to go through intermediate phases one of which valid for most of the countries of the world is democratic phase or phases. " It shows a failure to understand the significance of a revolutionary government as one of the greatest and finest "means" of effecting a political revolution" says Lenin. "The paltry "liberalism" flaunted here by the Bund in emulation of Iskra (that is to say, we can manage without any government, even a provisional one!) is sheer anarchist liberalism." (15)

We are constantly experiencing the fact that imperialists have no trouble in creating a justification for the intervention in any country. The tactical alertness and suggestions of Lenin and especially of Stalin about "intervention" in connection with the " revolutions" are still valid today. Without active work in masses, active participation of large masses, speaking of revolutionary democracy and socialist revolution remains to be

an illusion, mere phrase mongering of far-left Trotskyite variations.

"The Marxist solution to the problem of democracy, "says Lenin," is for the proletariat to utilize all democratic institutions and aspirations in its class struggle against the bourgeoisie in order to prepare for its overthrow and assure its own victory. "(57)

Each phase will have its own unique alliances totally contingent on the existing conditions, the balance of power, the existence or nonexistence of revolutionary situation and whether the minimal or maximal aim is on the agenda. One cannot copy from another country in which the conditions are different. One cannot copy the path to revolution, form of struggle means and methods – including the utilization of parliament - of a country where the subjective conditions are ripe, to another country where neither the subjective nor objective conditions exist. One most likely will reject the use of parliament in former, cannot reject in the latter all of which is translated into the character of alliances for each.

While the character of alliances will be wide range for a struggle against an autocracy, it will be lesser for the democratic struggle, only the proletariat and revolutionary democrats for the struggle towards revolutionary democracy and proletariat alone for the socialist revolution.

The form of struggle and utilization of democratic institution isolated from the existing conditions cannot play a decisive role. What is important and decisive at any given time is that what it aims, under whose leadership and the class character of alliances formed. The same way, it is not the form of the revolution, but the class essence of it matters. Uprisings toward revolution may have different forms and alliances in accord with the specific conditions at given times. The concept of

People's power (whatever the name is given) should have a context that brings it from the abstract down to concrete, one that has its feet on the ground in a way that people comprehend. The road to "People's Power" goes through the phases of planned uprisings followed by an insurrection and forming a provincial revolutionary government – Revolutionary Democracy. That should not be taken as the final goal by itself- which is reformism - but as a means of transforming bridge through another uprising into socialist revolution. Based on Lenin's assessments and proven then, and especially now, "uprising -> majority in parliament -> uprising -> socialist revolution" seems to be the general path to follow without disregarding the existing conditions in particular.

Notes and Related Articles to Read

(1) Stalin, The Diaries of Dimitrov, September 2, 1946

(2) Lenin, Letters on Tactics

(8) Lenin, A caricature of Bolshevism

(9) Stalin, Anarchism or Socialism?

(19) Lenin, "Political Agitation and "The Class Point of View"

(38) Lenin, Left Wing Communism

The years of organizing (pre-1903)

(20) The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats 1897 - P64

The years of preparation for revolution (1903–05)

(5) The Principal Stages in the History of Bolshevism – P94

The years of revolution (1905–07).

(11) Oneness of the Tsar and the People, and of the People and the Tsar", August 29, 1905 – P166

(12)Social-Democracy & the Provisional Revolutionary Government, April 1905 – P146

(14) Two Tactics, February 14, 1905 – P101

(15) The Theory of Spontaneous Generation, September 14, 1905 – P191

(22) The Social-Democrats and Electoral Agreements, October 1906 – P300

(26) The Social-Democratic Election Campaign in St. Petersburg, January21, 1907 – P329

(27) Stalin, Muddle..., April 10, 1907 – P362

(28) The Fifth Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, May 1907 – P341

(29) Stalin, The Advanced Proletariat, and the Fifth Party Congress, 1907– P358

(33) Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, June-July 1905 – P156

(34) The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., April 1905 – P125

(35) The Boycott of the Bulygin Duma, & Insurrection, August 16, 1905 - P162

(36) General Plan of the Third Congress Decisions, February 1905 – P117

(37) The Convening of The Third, party Congress, February 2 8, 1905 - P113

(39) Social-Democracy's Attitude Towards the Peasant Movement, September 14, 1905. – P178

(40) The Political Strike & the Street Fighting in Moscow, October 17, 1905 -P199

(41) Tasks of Revolutionary Army Contingents, October 1905 – P210

(42) On P. B. Axelrod's Pamphlet, the People's Duma, and a Workers' Congress, October 1905 – P216

(43) The Latest in Iskra Tactics, or Mock Elections as a New Incentive to an Uprising, October 17, 1905 – P220

(45) The Lessons of the Moscow Events, October 24, 1905 – P245

Petty-Bourgeois and Proletarian Socialism, November 7, 1905 – P258

(46) Before the Storm, August 21, 1906 – P293

(47) The Bolshevik Resolution on the State Duma, May 9, 1906 – P269

(48) The Peasant, or "Trudovik", Group & the R.S.D.L.P., May 11, 1906 – P281

The Unsound Arguments of the "Non-Party" Boycotters, July 1, 1906 - P 286

The years of reaction (1907–10).

A caricature of Bolshevism, April 4, 1909 – P365

The years of revival (1910–14)

(18) Revolutionary Social-Democrats, May 8, 1912 – P402

(25) Democracy and Narodism in China, July 15, 1912 – P408

(30) From the Camp of the Stolypin "Labour" Party, December 8, 1911 –P395

(31) The Slogans and Organisation of Social-Democratic Work Inside and Outside the Duma, December 8, 1911 – P381

(32) Duma", November 20, 1912 – P417

The Fourth Duma Election Campaign and the Tasks of the

Report to the International Socialist Bureau, “Elections to the Fourth

The Struggle of Parties in China, April 28, 1913 – P423

The First Imperialist World War (1914–17)

Karl Marx, A Brief Biographical Sketch with an Exposition of Marxism,1914

(6) The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self- Determination, October 16, 1915– P426

(57) Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov) 1916 - P430

The second revolution in Russia (February- October 1917)

(3) Speech Made at the First Petrograd Conference of Shop Committees May 31, 1917, June 16, 1917 – P 501

(4) First All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, June 3–24, 1917 – P485

(13) The Political Situation (Four Theses), July 10, 1917 – P503

(16) Marxism and Insurrection, A Letter to the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), September 13, 1917 – P523

(21) Stalin, The Second Wave, September 9, 1917 – P515

(23) War and Revolution, A Lecture Delivered May 14, 1917 – P448

(24) Petrograd City R.S.D.L.P.(B.) Conference, APRIL 14, 1917 – P441

(44) From Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power? October 1917 – P542

(49) A Strong Revolutionary Government, May 19, 1917 – P479

(50) Stealing a March on the Workers, May 6, 1917 – P444

(51) A Regrettable Deviation from the Principles of Democracy, May 10, 1917 – P438

(52) The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It, October 1917 - P548

(53) The Petty-Bourgeois Stand on the Question of Economic Disorganization, May 31, 1917 – P482

(54) Stalin, Outcome of the Moscow Conference, August 17, 1917 – P507

Stalin, The Conspiracy Continues, August 28, 1917 – P510

(56) Heroes of Fraud & the Mistakes of the Bolsheviks, September 22, 1917 – P531

After revolution (October 1917 -on)

(10) Should We Participate in Bourgeois Parliaments? 1920 – P599

(17) Revolutionary Phrase mongering, February 21, 1918 – P563

(55) Moscow Party Workers' Meeting, November 27, 1918 – P578

On Reform and Reformism

Confusing the "reform" with "reformism"; further shift to the right of reformism

"the entire minimum programme of the R.S.D.L.P.,which envisaged a struggle for democratic reforms that would facilitate the preparation and transition to the socialist revolution. Like the old “economists,” who could not understand the need for the political struggle of the working class under conditions of capitalism, the “imperialist economists” did not understand the significance of the struggle for democratic reforms under conditions of imperialism." (1)

To confuse reform with reformism , on one hand, is a result of learning Marxism Leninism by rote and not applying the dialectic of Marxism to the subject, on the other and more often is a result of anarcho-Trotskyite tactics. They lump and equate the meaning and context of each term in order to reject any struggle for reform and disguise themselves as anti-reformist, anti-revisionist “revolutionaries”. Lenin states:

" Recognition of revolutionary activity along the lines indicated above, not denial of legal activity and of the struggle for reforms, should be the essence of the “struggle against the Marsh (= wavering, lack of principle, “turn table”, weathercock). " (2)

Contrary to misconception that Reforms (not reformism) excludes revolution, Lenin says, "Reforms do not, of course, exclude revolution " (page 23), but reform is not a revolution, but an alternative to the revolution for the forced bourgeoisie. Lenin continues; “The point is that revolutionaries must not exclude themselves, not give way to reformism, i.e., that socialists should not substitute reformist work for their revolutionary work.” (3)

(Not Reforms) Reformism excludes revolution, it is counter-revolutionary ideology that limits change.

The concept of "reform", " says Lenin," is undoubtedly the opposite of the concept of "revolution". Not remembering this contradiction, not remembering the line separating these two concepts constantly causes serious mistakes in all historical debates. However, this contrast is not an absolute thing, this line is not a dead thing, on the contrary, it is a living and changing thing, and the individual must be able to define it in any specific case. " (4)

In other words, "reform" in connection with the revolutionary struggle cannot be handled in an absolute context in all situations and periods, such as " it does not serve the revolution, but serves the counter revolution," or " serves the revolution ". It should be handled in a concrete context with its vitality and variability in the revolutionary situation and in non-revolutionary situations and based on the evaluation of any given specific situations.

First of all, reforms are not a product of "reformists", but they are democratic rights which the working people have gained as a result of their opposition, active reaction, and struggle against the power of capital, that is, even if it was spontaneous, they are the byproduct of a struggle . "Reforms are a by-product of the revolutionary struggle" says Lenin (5) And for those who claims otherwise, Lenin says " What have metaphysics got to do with it, when historical experience, the experience of England, France, Germany and Russia, the experience of all modern history in Europe and Asia, shows that serious reforms have always been merely the by-product of a movement completely free of the narrowness of reformism?" (6)

Reform and reformism are not one and the same. Reform, regardless of its extent, refers to the right gained as a result of

the struggle. Reformism is the attempt to take the struggle of working people for reforms, the degree of rights gained under control and to prevent it from going further. One is related to the "gained - or desired to gain" right(s), the other is the ideology and practice of limiting the struggle to these rights in order to prevent revolutions. Reformists, as Lenin puts it," only recognize reforms, they reject revolution" (7) "We are by no means opposed to the fight for reforms." (8)

Stalin explains it as follows; " the bourgeoisie may sometimes concede certain partial reforms while remaining on the basis of the existing social-economic system. Acting in this way, it calculates that these concessions are necessary in order to preserve its class rule. This is the essence of reform. Revolution, however, means the transference of power from one class to another. That is why it is impossible to describe any reform as revolution." (9)

"Reformist tactics," says Lenin, " are unlikely to achieve real reforms. The most effective way to secure real reforms is to pursue the tactics of the revolutionary class struggle. In fact, reforms are won as a result of the revolutionary class struggle because of its independence, mass power and determination. " (10)

So, the "reforms" are not the achievements of reformists but of revolutionary struggle. "In contrast to the reformists fight for reforms to hinder revolutionary struggle, in view of the Marxist Leninists" all struggles for reforms should be channeled and must be converted into the revolutionary struggle. "(Page 96)

In other words, the struggle of the Marxist Leninists is not against "reforms", but against "reformism" and "reformists", who take the struggle for reform and reforms -which are inseparable part of the democratic struggle- as a final goal, and to limit the struggle of the masses only with "reforms" .

"Unlike anarchists," says Lenin," Marxists recognize the struggle for reforms, that is, they recognize the struggle for measures that improve the conditions of the entire working class, without destroying the power of the ruling class. They carry out the most decisive struggle against reformists, which directly or indirectly restrict them. Reformism is the bourgeois deceit of workers who will always remain a paid slave, as long as capital is dominant. " (11)

Therefore, in terms of the tactical approach to reforms, Lenin says, " We shall never reduce our tasks to that of supporting the slogans of the reformist bourgeoisie that are most in vogue. " And continues," We pursue an independent policy and put forward only such reforms as are undoubtedly favourable to the interests of the revolutionary struggle, that undoubtedly enhance the independence, class-consciousness and fighting efficiency of the proletariat. Only by such tactics can reforms from above, which are always half-hearted, always hypocritical, and always conceal some bourgeois or police snare, be made innocuous. " (10)

Lenin summarizes the difference. Marxist Leninists and class-conscious " workers struggle for better conditions and use them to speed up the fight against wage-slavery. The reformists try to divide and deceive the workers with little concessions to take them apart from the class struggle. But workers use reforms to develop and expand the class struggle, seeing the false nature of reformism. " (11)

" Revolutionaries, " says Lenin," they played a tremendous historical role in the social struggle and in all social crises, even if the immediate result of these crises was semi-voluntary reforms. "And it reveals the essence of what reform is; "Revolutionaries are leaders of the social forces that affect all changes; reforms are by-products of the revolutionary struggle". (5)

Only those who have no ties with the masses, do not trust the masses, have been participating in the choir of religious or otherwise reactionaries for years, singing the same songs with them, would consider the reaction, struggle, and achievements of the working peoples as the gain of "reformism". Since, aside from being indifferent to the democratic demands of the masses, they take a stand against these demands, do not understand, and do not believe the power of the masses, according to them any gain is only the gain of or this or that party in order to soften the anger and hatred of the masses and to try channeling it in the interests of the system. And again, according to them, any democratization in the political system is simply a deception without any benefit to the working people and their struggle. According to Lenin, however, " The more democratic the system of government, the clearer will the workers see that the root evil is capitalism, not lack of rights." (12)

For those phrasemakers who argue that the fight for reforms is not "class" struggle, but a conciliatory one; " "The class perspective " on the political struggle, says Lenin, " requires the proletariat to provide a driving force for every democratic movement. The political demands of working-class democracy are in principle not different from those of bourgeois democracy, the difference is quantitative ... we have many allies in the struggle for political liberation, and we should not be indifferent to them. "" (13)

Likewise, "The revolutionary proletariat," says Lenin, " will reject such a theory with contempt. .... the demand for the republic, for arming the people, for the separation of the Church from the State, for full democratic liberties, and for decisive economic reforms." (14)

Unlike revisionists and left-wing phrasemakers rejecting to fight for reforms at every situation, Lenin says; " everywhere

the Marxist workers are ahead of the liquidators, in the direct, immediate, “day-to-day” activity of agitation, organisation, fighting for reforms and using them. " (11)

Marxist Leninists " has always included the struggle for reforms as part of its activities." (15) But unlike reformists, ML " subordinates the struggle for reforms, as the part to the whole, to the revolutionary struggle for freedom and for socialism. " (15) In the same way, Lenin states that the "Marxists are working tirelessly, not missing a single “possibility” of winning and using reforms, and not condemning, but supporting, painstakingly developing every step beyond reformism in propaganda, agitation, mass economic struggle, etc. " (11)

"" Those who refrain from making efforts in this way... make the liberals dominate, hand over the political education of the workers to their hands and leave the sovereignty in the political struggle to the leaders of the bourgeois democracy in the final analysis. ”(13)

As a result of the uneven development of capitalism in different countries, the "bourgeoisie" says Lenin, " as represented by their ideologists and political leaders, are coming out increasingly in defense of so-called social reforms as opposed to the idea of social revolution. Not liberalism versus socialism, but reformism versus socialist revolution—is the formula of the modern, “advanced”, educated bourgeoisie. " (7)

To stop the evolving struggles of the masses and channeling them into reformism, " everywhere the bourgeoisie seek, in one way or another, to corrupt the workers and turn them into contented slaves who have given up all thought of doing away with slavery. " (11)

It is an illusion to expect revolutionarism from the "masses" while being isolated from them and disinterested in their economic and democratic demands. Inevitably, due to

desperation and lack of leadership, the masses will be under the influence of reformists. And as Lenin puts it; " The stronger the reformist influence among workers, the weaker the workers, the more they depend on the bourgeoisie. " (11)

Stalin summarizes the difference between Marxism Leninism and reformism as follows;

" To a reformist, reforms are everything, while revolutionary work is something incidental, something just to talk about, mere eyewash. That is why, with reformist tactics under the conditions of bourgeois rule, reforms are inevitably transformed into an instrument for strengthening that rule, an instrument for disintegrating the revolution. ……. To a revolutionary, on the contrary, the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms; to him reforms are a byproduct of the revolution. That is why, with revolutionary tactics under the conditions of bourgeois rule, reforms are naturally transformed into an instrument for disintegrating that rule, into an instrument for strengthening the revolution, into a strongpoint for the further development of the revolutionary movement. "". (9)

Mixing the “reform” and the struggle for “reforms” with “reformism” and “reformist” means moving away from the ABCs of Marxism and breaking its wings. Especially in times when there is no revolutionary situation, in Lenin's words, " A period of reform. The absence of a revolutionary situation. This is the essence of the work." (16)

"The liquidators are reformers ..." says Lenin and continues; " If there were a group that denied the use of reforms and partial improvements, we could not join it, because that would be a non-Marxist policy, a policy harmful to the workers. Neither could we join the liquidators, because repudiation and abuse of the “underground”, repudiation and relegation of the two

“pillars”, the advocacy in present-day Russia of a struggle for a legal party and the possibility of political reforms—all this is a betrayal of the working class, desertion to the bourgeoisie. " (17)

In these seemingly complicated words, Lenin emphasizes that the rejection of reforms and the struggle for them is anti-Marxist, as well as betrayal of the working class in association with reformists, that is, he reveals the difference between reform and reformism.

In terms of the importance of struggle for reforms, it is useful to quote the following words of Lenin in evaluating a period;

" Yes, we are undoubtedly passing through an era of reforms….. Of course, these are not the reforms that denote an own-grade in political development…. Such reforms are always foretokens and precursors of revolution. " (18)

“We try to help the working class to get the smallest possible” says Lenin, “but real improvement (economic & political) in their situation and we add always that no reform can be durable, sincere, serious if not seconded by revolutionary methods of struggle of the masses. We preach always that a socialist party not uniting this struggle for reforms with the revolutionary methods of working-class movement can become a sect, can be severed from the masses, and that is the most pernicious menace to the success of the clear-cut revolutionary socialism.” (19)

The struggle for "reforms" and for the demands as such, is not only carrying an important weight for the "preparatory period" – where a revolutionary situation does not exist. Any demand for "reform", in any specific time, at the same time, may carry within the agitation of revolutionary "uprising". (Other than Exceptions) The masses will not spontaneously rise up collectively, most likely, one or more "reform" demands of that specific period for the broadest masses will be the reason for

this insurrection and may be the leadership's insurrection agitation.

Consequently, “reforms” and “reformist’, “reformism” should not be confused. In pursuit of an "anti-revisionist" appearance, disguise, such "far-left" approaches are essentially not revolutionary, but reactionary, further to the right of reformists. If the issue is "the fight against revisionism”, as Lenin puts, it is

" not the denial of legal activity and of the struggle for reforms, (it) should be the essence of the “struggle against the Marsh (revisionism). " (2) “The "Kautskyites", the "Centre", are revolutionaries in word and reformists in deed” (20)

” Divorce the struggle for reforms from the struggle for the final goal—that is what Bernstein’s preaching actually amounts to. Divorce the struggle for improvements, for freedom of association, etc., from the struggle against reformism, from the defense of Marxism, from its spirit and its political trend—that is what the preaching of D., and the other liquidators actually amounts to.” (21)

Notes and related articles to Read

(1) Lenin, CW 38, P 582-583

(2) Lenin, Notebook Alpha, Our Struggle Against the “Marsh” Page 173

(3) Lenin, Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism Page 131

(4) Lenin, Apropos of an Anniversary Page 29

(5) Lenin, "The Peasant Reform" and the Proletarian-Peasant Revolution Page 42

(6) Lenin, The Liberal Bourgeoisie and Reformism Page 79

(7) Lenin , Reformism in the Russian Social-Democratic Movement Page 58

(8) Lenin, disarmament slogan Page 169

(9) Stalin, Marxism vs Liberalism Page 176

(10) Lenin, Once Again About the Duma Cabinet Page 88

(11) Lenin, Marxism and Reformism Page 18

(12) Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism Page172

(13) Lenin, Political Agitation And the "Class Point of view" Page 104

(14) Lenin, Social-Democracy, and the provisional Revolutionary Government Page 115

(15) Lenin, Trade-Unionist Politics And Social-Democratic Politics Page 126

(16) Lenin, May day and War, Collapse of Pacifist Dreams Page 16

(17) Lenin, Two Paths Page 24

(18) Lenin, An Era of Reforms Page 101

(19) Lenin, Letter to the Secretary of the Socialist Propaganda League Page 167

(20) Lenin, The Agrarian and National Programs Page 170

(21) Lenin, Non-Party Intellectuals Against Marxism Page 159

Lenin, Remarks on an Article About Maximalism Page 96

ON RESTORATION OF CAPITALISM

> "Only blockheads or masked enemies who with their boastfulness want to conceal their hostility and are striving to demobilize the people, can deny the danger of military intervention and attempts at restoration as long as the capitalist encirclement exists." (1) "We are living not merely in a State but in a system of States, and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to coexist for a long period side by side with imperialist States. Ultimately one or other must conquer "(2)

The question of "Restoration of Capitalism" in countries where the "dictatorship of Proletariat"- commonly called socialism (15) "reigned, with few exceptions, so far has been dealt with a bourgeois and Trotskyite- bourgeois lackeys under left disguise – outlook.

One of these exceptions is the book titled" the question of restoration in socialism" by Hidir Yesil, which takes up the study of the first and most advanced experience in the construction of socialism, the experience of the Soviet Union. In his book, Yesil, largely examines the economic theory and practice of economic construction side of the question of restoration during the phase of building socialism. In his book he is not taking up the social political, the education and cultural aspects of the question. He sees the economic field as the most neglected aspect of the question in the study of the question of restoration. Unlike most, he stresses that "the whole book deals mostly with mistakes. This is not done to deny or minimize the achievements in the construction of socialism." He reasons that the construction of socialism in its real meaning and the uninterrupted continuation of the revolution will not be possible in the future without discovering the mistakes of the past experiences in building

socialism and thus preventing their repetition. He states that “It is our duty and responsibility to detect and overcome the mistakes of the past experience”. He summarizes the reason for his taken up the subject and for the restoration:

> “Undoubtedly, there are a number of studies conducted and efforts made to reveal the material, economic and class basis of corruption. But in my opinion, none of this has been sufficient. In this book, I want to make a complimentary contribution to eliminate this deficiency.
>
> “The concept of “restoration”, which is generally accepted in the Marxist-Leninist ranks, is not a concept that fully describes the truth. What has been experienced in the Soviet Union and the "Eastern Bloc Countries" clustered around it, and in China and Albania, is not a "return to the old” in the sense that the overthrown former rulers came back to the power. In this "return", there is a new type of bourgeoisie emerged and developed from within the socialist system. Restoration brought about a bourgeoisie made up of bureaucrats and technocrats who use their ruling and decision-making positions in the state and in the enterprises for their own interests, and a new type of capitalism, a bureaucratic state capitalism.
>
> Undoubtedly, the first condition that makes a socialism the socialism is the class context of its political power. The political power, the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" which the proletariat does not share with any faction of the bourgeoisie, is an indispensable precondition for socialism. As this is the case, in a country if power passes into the hands of revisionists speaking in the name of socialism, which was once socialist, and they find the opportunity to implement their own programs,

"corruption", "restoration" is inevitable in the process." (3)

It is crucially important to study the question of "restoration" in all its aspects. However, it is as crucially important to bear in mind and make the dialectical connection with the facts and the related theories. Yesil considers the economic aspect of the question as the most neglected. As far as a sincere Marxist Leninists study of the individual aspects of the question for the "lessons learned", he may well be right. However, as a whole, the most neglected, overlooked or consciously disregarded aspects of the question in core is related to the continuing class struggle within the socialist country and with the "capitalist encirclement "abroad. The struggle within against the right and left deviation, and struggle without, against the international capitalist pressure, economic and political blockade in combination plays a decisive role in the process of restoration. Cuba, which has been subjected to economic and political blockade for 60 years is a good example for this - by taking back steps and forward steps in order not to be defeated. The study of the "defeat" - Restoration of capitalism" in Soviet Russia cannot be objective without basing the study on the class struggle within and without and without considering the concrete conditions and situations within those periods; the world war, civil war, famine, plots of counter revolutionaries in aligned with fascist Germany and other imperialists, second world war. One cannot study a question objectively without making the distinction between positive concrete conditions and negative conditions both of which will have different impact on and implications of the application of the economic and social programs. We cannot study a subject with the current or assumed "normal" conditions and mind-set of "now" while the question is related to the conditions and mind-set of "then". There is no possible way of knowing the exact conditions and thereupon, mind-set of "then" with the second

or third hand plus knowledge of "now" related to then. That's why Marxist Leninists try their best to be objective and study the question as a whole with all the dialectic connections to it. Bourgeoisie and revisionist counter revolutionaries search and handpick the aspects of the question disconnected and isolated from the whole aspects of the question in order to present a conclusion of "inherent failure of socialism "as a system.

Bourgeoisie portrays the question as the "failure" of socialism as a political and economic system. By doing so they try to create the illusion that capitalism is "eternal" because there is no other alternative economic system. The choice of word "failure" is not a coincidental one. Failure implies not succeeding in the achievement of intended objective, in this case, the lack of "inherent" ability for success, it does not imply being beaten in a struggle. Due to this lack of inherent ability, "failure" suggests giving up and not trying again.

"Defeat" implies being beaten in a struggle and it is not an end in itself. That's why the bourgeoisie and variety of Trotskyites use the term or concludes "failure".

What should be bored in mind is that;

1-Socialism has not "failed" but been" defeated".

2-"Restoration of capitalism "has never been seen as "impossible" by Marxist Leninists. Contrary, the danger and possibility of restoration have always been seen as inevitable in small-peasant countries in particular, and as long as the capitalist encirclement existed in general.

3-The reasons for the restoration should not be studied "domestically"-internal class struggle- alone but in relation with the "international capitalists" - external class struggle. A study without this dialectic connection will end up either

blaming all to the “internal” mistakes! or justifying, overlooking the “internal mistakes.”

4- Similarly, approach to the bureaucracy - as the scapegoat for restoration – should not be taken as something existence of which is impossible in Socialist Society- the lower phase of communism, but like the state, as a phenomenon which will wither away during the transition to communist society. It is not something that could be avoided but controlled.

I will not be dwelling on the bourgeois insidious use of the term “fail” in order to dismiss socialism as an alternative to capitalism. However, their servile Trotskyite approach which purposely disregards the above-mentioned facts is not so much different than that of bourgeoisie for it denies socialism and postpones the revolutions to an indefinite date.

It is beneficial to study the subject in the field of Bureaucracy and Economy. However, this should be done by stressing the fact that this is not the only and main reason in isolation from the class struggle in general and from the struggle against the “right” and “left deviation” in the party in particular. Due to the same consequence kinship between the two deviations, the victory of either one or both will inevitably lay the ground for and eventually bring about the defeat of socialism and restoration of capitalism.

Right deviation underestimates the enemy, the danger of capitalist restoration, and fails to understand the nature of the class struggle under the proletarian dictatorship. As Stalin states in his reply; “ I said plainly in my speech that the Right deviation "underestimates the strength of capitalism" in our country, "does not see the danger of the restoration of capitalism," "does not understand the mechanism of the class struggle," "and therefore so readily agrees to make concessions to capitalism." I said plainly in my speech that "the triumph of

the Right deviation in our Party" would "increase the chances of the restoration of capitalism in our country." [17]

On the other side of the kinship, left deviation's overestimating the forces of enemy, underestimating the possibility of and denial of socialism in one country and underestimating the importance of and animosity to the peasantry, to the rest of the laboring masses is a tendency that weakens the proletarian dictatorship. As Stalin pointed out; "As to the "Left," Trotskyist, deviation, I said plainly in my speech that it denies the possibility of building socialism in our country, rejects the idea of an alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and is prepared to carry out its fantastic plan of industrialization at the cost of a split with the peasantry. I said in my speech (if you have read it) that "the triumph of the 'Left' deviation in our Party would lead to the working class being separated from its peasant base to the vanguard of the working class being separated from the rest of the working-class masses, and, consequently, to the defeat of the proletariat and to facilitating conditions for the restoration of capitalism." " [17]

Stalin, in a Letter to Kaganovich and Molotov criticizing Pravda on the trial says; "They should have said that talk that the Zinovievites and Trotskyites have no platform is a fraud on the part of these scum and a self-deception by our comrades. These scums had a platform. The gist of their platform was the defeat of socialism in the USSR and the restoration of capitalism... As far back as the X party congress, Lenin said that if a faction or factions persist in their errors in their struggle against the party, under the Soviet system they will, without fail, slide down to the level of White Guardism, the defense of capitalism, a struggle against the Soviets, and must, without fail, merge with the enemies of Soviet rule. This proposition by Lenin has now been brilliantly confirmed." [18]

During his 1938 trial, Bukharin stating that his followers organized a conference at the end of the summer of 1932 in where anticommunist, counter revolutionary bourgeois platform was approved, said “I fully agreed with this platform and I bear full responsibility for it.” (4)

At the same Court proceedings Vyshinsky had summarized the role and consequences of deviations ;

> "It is not an accident because prior to the October Revolution as well, Trotsky and his friends fought against Lenin and Lenin's Party as they fight now against Stalin and the Party of Lenin and Stalin.
>
> They come to their shameful end because they have followed this role for many years, have sung the praises of capitalism and have lacked faith in the success of socialist construction and in the victory of socialism.
>
> "That is why they come finally to develop a program of capitalist restoration. That is why they proceeded to betray and sell our native land." (5)

It is clear that the question of restoration is not only limited to one side of subject. Possible victory of the right or left deviation is a tendency that paves the way for the restoration of capitalism through strengthening the capitalist tendencies and weakening the socialist construction attempts in economy.”

“Restoration of capitalism “has never been seen as “impossible” by Marxist Leninists.

“The revolution can defeat the bourgeoisie, can overthrow its power, even without the dictatorship of the proletariat. “ says Lenin, and follows; “but the revolution will be unable to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie, to maintain its victory and to push forward to the final victory of socialism unless, at a certain stage in its development, it creates a special organ in the form

of the dictatorship of the proletariat as its principal mainstay. " (6)

"The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of power." (Lenin.) Does this mean that all that is required is to assume power, to seize it? No, it does not. The seizure of power is only the beginning." [19]

Therefore, the conquest of political power by the proletariat and the establishment of Proletarian Dictatorship is the precondition for the economic- socialist revolution and building socialist economy. The economic Policy of the Proletarian dictatorship becomes the policy of transforming the capitalist (in some cases semi-feudal) economic foundation into a socialist foundation, whereby, at the same time laying the economic foundation for the protection and strengthening of the conquered political power. It is the policy of, as Lenin puts it "laying the economic foundation for the political gains of the Soviet state, or we shall lose them all" [20] it was the policy of transition during the period when "capitalism has been smashed but socialism has not yet been built." [21] with the Policy of "NEP Russia will become socialist Russia." [22]

Unlike the illusion that the class struggle will cease in the morning of conquering the Political Power Lenin points out that "The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of the class struggle, but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the class struggle of the proletariat, which has won victory and has seized political power, against the bourgeoisie, which although vanquished has not been annihilated, has not disappeared, has not ceased its resistance, has increased its resistance" [23]

In reference to the possibility of "restoration", in a country such as Russia with a dominant peasant economy, " Lenin's thesis " says Stalin, "remains valid that "as long as we live in a small-

peasant country, there is a surer economic basis for capitalism in Russia than for communism," and that, consequently, the danger of the restoration of capitalism is no empty phrase. “[P211] “Lenin says that so long as individual peasant economy, which engenders capitalists and capitalism, predominates in the country, the danger of a restoration of capitalism will exist. Clearly, so long as this danger exists there can be no serious talk of the victory of socialist construction in our country.” (10)

"The transition from capitalism to communism," says Lenin, "represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration. And after their first serious defeat. the overthrown exploiters -- who had not expected their overthrow, never believed it possible, never conceded the thought of it -- throw themselves with energy grown tenfold, with furious passion and hatred grown a hundredfold into the battle for the recovery of the 'paradise' of which they have been deprived, on behalf of their families, who had been leading such a sweet and easy life and whom now the 'common herd' is condemning to ruin and destitution (or to 'common' labour . . .). In the train of the capitalist exploiters follow the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie, with regard to whom decades of historical experience of all countries testify that they vacillate and hesitate, one day marching behind the proletariat and the next day taking fright at the difficulties of the revolution; that they become panic stricken at the first defeat or semi-defeat of the workers, grow nervous, rush about, snivel, and run from one camp into the other." [19]

The question of restoration is not only a question of “bureaucracy” but a question of setting up the economic foundation and creating the culture to root out all the causes for it – which is not a day struggle and work but a struggle that

extends through entire phase of transition from capitalism to communism – in its scientific meaning, the higher stage of communism. The struggle is not only from top down, but also from bottom up, a combined effort that relies on the change of people's attitudes, habits, culture.

"You will have to go through 15, 20, 50 years of civil wars and international conflicts," Marx said to the workers, "not only to change existing conditions, but also to change yourselves and to make yourselves capable of wielding political power." *(See Marx and Engels, Works, Vol. VIII, p. 506.)*

Lenin says: "It will be necessary under the dictatorship of the proletariat to re-educate millions of peasants and small proprietors, hundreds of thousands of office employees, officials and bourgeois intellectuals, to subordinate them all to the proletarian state and to proletarian leadership, to overcome their bourgeois habits and traditions," just as we must " -- in a protracted struggle waged on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat -- re-educate the proletarians themselves, who do not abandon their petty bourgeois prejudices at one stroke, by a miracle, at the bidding of the Virgin Mary, at the bidding of a slogan, resolution or decree, but only in the course of a long and difficult mass struggle against mass petty-bourgeois influences." (7)

Against the revisionist illusion Lenin states that "the transformation into something new by no means eliminates the old" in all aspects overnight, and "the economic foundations for the withering away of the state": in this case we also have the "economic foundations" for the withering away of bureaucracy," (8)

Hand picking one aspect of the question in a way that is dialectically broken off from all the rest of the aspects and studying it, will bound to end in wrong overall conclusions

regardless of the correctness of the subject taken. Leninism teaches that "the final victory of Socialism, in the sense of full guarantee against the restoration of bourgeois relations, is possible only on an international scale" (9)

The reasons for the restoration should not be studied without the dialectic connection of “internal” and external class struggle.

> “We have internal enemies. We have external enemies. This, comrades, must not be forgotten for a single moment.” [24]

The internal aspect of the question is related to the mutual relations of classes within the country. “The abolition of classes,” says Stalin, “is not achieved by the extinction of the class struggle, but by its intensification.” (11)

The class struggle continues under the proletarian dictatorship although, in altered form. The political Power of Capitalism has been overthrown, replaced by the political power of proletarian and economic foundation for socialism is being built. However, capitalism is far from being uprooted. Especially in early stages it survives with the unavoidable existence of capitalist ideology, of the small producers and unorganized market relations, thus, so the possibilities of a restoration of capitalism. the proletarian dictatorship under the leadership of the Communist Party wages relentless war against the restoration of capitalist conditions, against the remnants of the capitalist system and takes the necessary steps to construct the foundations of the new social order. However, the bourgeoisie has its grounds for making attempts at restoration, because for a long time after its overthrow it remains stronger than the proletariat which has overthrown it.

"If the exploiters are defeated in one country only," says Lenin, "and this, of course, is the typical case, since a simultaneous

revolution in a number of countries is a rare exception, they still remain stronger than the exploited." (25)

Unlike capitalism which has centuries of experience to draw lessons from, socialism is the first in the history of class society in which the state power is not of the few rich, but of the working masses. Conquering the political power will have to follow a long period of consolidating the rule of working class – the proletarian dictatorship. As for the weakness and yet power of the working class as the ruling class, Stalin states;

> "as regards promoting the cultural powers of the working class, developing in it the faculty of administering the country in connection with the carrying out of the slogan of self-criticism Lenin said:
>
> "The chief thing we lack is culture, ability to administer. ... Economically and politically, N E P fully ensures us the possibility of laying the foundation of a socialist economy. It is 'only' a matter of the cultural forces of the proletariat and of its vanguard."
>
> What does this mean? It means that one of the main tasks of our constructive work is to develop in the working class the faculty and ability to administer the country, to administer economy, to administer industry.
>
> Can we develop this faculty and ability in the working class without giving full play to the powers and capacities of the workers, the powers, and capacities of the finest elements of the working class, for criticizing our errors, for detecting our shortcomings and for advancing our work? Obviously, we cannot.
>
> And what is required in order to give full play to the powers and capacities of the working class and the working people generally, and to enable them to

acquire the faculty of administering the country? It requires, above all, honest and Bolshevik observance of the slogan of self-criticism, honest and Bolshevik observance of the slogan of criticism from below of shortcomings and errors in our work. If the workers take advantage of the opportunity to criticise shortcomings in our work frankly and bluntly, to improve and advance our work, what does that mean? It means that the workers are becoming active participants in the work of directing the country, economy, industry. And this cannot but enhance in the workers the feeling that they are the masters of the country, cannot but enhance their activity, their vigilance, their culture.

This question of the cultural powers of the working class is a decisive one. Why? Because, of all the ruling classes that have hitherto existed, the working class, as a ruling class, occupies a somewhat special and not altogether favourable position in history. All ruling classes until now—the slave-owners, the landlords, the capitalists—were also wealthy classes. They were in a position to train in their sons the knowledge and faculties needed for government. The working class differs from them, among other things, in that it is not a wealthy class, that it was not able formerly to train in its sons the knowledge and faculty of government, and has become able to do so only now, after coming to power." [24]

As for the additional advantage of capitalist, Stalin asks the Question "Wherein lies the strength of the overthrown bourgeoisie.? ";

Firstly, "in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie." *(See Vol. XXV, p. 173.)*

Secondly, in the fact that "for a long time after the revolution the exploiters inevitably retain a number of great practical advantages: they still have money (it is impossible to abolish money all at once); some movable property -- often fairly considerable; they still have various connections, habits of organization and management, knowledge of all the 'secrets' (customs, methods, means and possibilities) of management, superior education, close connections with the higher technical personnel (who live and think like the bourgeoisie), incomparably greater experience in the art of war (this is very important), and so on, and so forth." *(See Vol. XXIII, p 354)*

Thirdly, "in the force of habit, in the strength of small production. For, unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in the world, and small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale" . . . for "the abolition of classes means not only driving out the landlords and capitalists -- that we accomplished with comparative ease -- it also means abolishing the small commodity producers, and they cannot be driven out, or crushed; we must live in harmony with them, they can (and must) be remolded and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organizational work." *(See Vol. XXV, pp. 173 and l89.) [19]*

"The victory of socialism over capitalism and the consolidation of socialism " Lenin states, "may be regarded as ensured only when the proletarian State, having completely suppressed all resistance on the part of the exploiters and secured complete stability for itself and complete obedience, reorganizes the whole of industry on the basis of large-scale collective production and on a modern technical basis (founded on the

electrification of the whole of national economy). This alone will enable the towns to render such, radical assistance, technical and social, to the backward and scattered rural population as will create the material basis for enormously raising the productivity of agriculture, and of agricultural labour in general, thereby stimulating the small tillers of the soil by the force of example and in their own interests to adopt large-scale, collective mechanized agriculture." (12)

Most bourgeois and revisionist so called “studies” take up the question disregarding the fact that peasantry and petty producers still plays a large role in the country. "As long as we live in a petit-bourgeois country, “Lenin says, “capitalism has in Russia a stronger economic basis than communism" and that, “consequently, the danger of the restoration of capitalism is no empty phrase.” [26] “Lenin says that so long as individual peasant economy, which engenders capitalists and capitalism, predominates in the country, the danger of a restoration of capitalism will exist. Clearly, so long as this danger exists there can be no serious talk of the victory of socialist construction in our country.” (10)

In addition the existence of the division between mental and manual labor, inevitable distinguishing categories of managers and technicians apart from the working class as far as the differences in the nature of their work which brings about different life style, higher wages will always make the danger of the emergence of a new type of bourgeoisie and the attempts for and restoration of capitalism possible.

Right and or left deviations” whoever fights against the party and the government in the USSR stands for the defeat of socialism and the restoration of capitalism.” Stalin to Kaganovich and Molotov

The possibility is always there and will be there until the transition from socialism to communism which prerequisites the defeat of capitalism in world scale.

External Class Struggle

The international aspect of the question is related to the relations of proletarian dictatorship with the capitalist countries. Under the conditions of two opposite systems there always will be the danger of armed aggression against the socialist country by imperialist Powers. As Lenin puts it; "We are living not merely in a State but in a system of States, and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to coexist for a long period side by side with imperialist States. Ultimately one or other must conquer "(2)

Stalin pointing out the internal and external enemies says; "now the bourgeoisie of the whole world are supporting the Russian bourgeoisie, and they are still ever so much stronger than we are." [27] And "only blockheads or masked enemies who with their boastfulness want to conceal their hostility and are striving to demobilize the people, can deny the danger of military intervention and attempts at restoration as long as the capitalist encirclement exists." (2)

Stalin, in his speech at the Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I quotes from the Fourteenth Conference resolution in 1925 which summarizes the situation and the internal and external class struggle;

> "Generally, the victory of socialism in one country (not in the sense of final victory) is unquestionably possible."

And further:

> "... The existence of two directly opposite social systems gives rise to the constant menace of capitalist blockade, of other forms of economic pressure, of armed

intervention, of restoration. Consequently, the only guarantee of the final victory of socialism, i.e., the guarantee against restoration, is a victorious socialist revolution in a number of countries. It by no means follows from this that it is impossible to build a complete socialist society in a backward country like Russia without the 'state aid' (Trotsky) of countries more developed technically and economically. An integral part of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is the assertion that 'real progress of a socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the major European countries' (Trotsky, 1922)—an assertion which in the present period condemns the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. to fatalistic passivity. In opposition to such 'theories,' Comrade Lenin wrote: 'Infinitely hackneyed is the argument that they learned by rote during the development of West-European Social-Democracy, namely, that we are not yet ripe for socialism, that, as certain "learned" gentlemen among them express it, the objective economic prerequisites for socialism do not exist in our country' (Notes on Sukhanov)." *(Resolution of the Fourteenth Conference of the R.C.P.(B.) on "The Tasks of the Comintern and the R.C.P.(B.) in Connection with the Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I.")*

"the international bourgeoisie is filled with furious hatred of, and hostility towards, Soviet Russia, and is prepared at any moment to fling itself upon her in order to strangle her... In Russia, the big landowners and capitalists have not vanished, but they have been subjected to total expropriation and crushed politically as a class, whose remnants are hiding out among Soviet government employees. They have preserved their class organisation abroad, as émigrés, ... These émigrés are

> striving, with might and main, to destroy the Soviet power and restore capitalism in Russia... This being the internal situation in Russia, the main task now confronting her proletariat, as the ruling class, is properly to determine and carry out the measures that are necessary to lead the peasantry, establish a firm alliance with them and achieve the transition, in a series of gradual stages, to large-scale, socialised, mechanized agriculture." [28]

Taking the issue of "external "aspect of the question Stalin says;

> "External conditions. We have assumed power in a country whose technical equipment is terribly backward. Along with a few big industrial units more or less based upon modern technology, we have hundreds and thousands of mills and factories the technical equipment of which is beneath all criticism from the point of view of modern achievements. At the same time, we have around us a number of capitalist countries whose industrial technique is far more developed and up to date than that of our country. Look at the capitalist countries and you will see that their technology is not only advancing, but advancing by leaps and bounds, outstripping the old forms of industrial technique. And so we find that, on the one hand, we in our country have the most advanced system, the Soviet system, and the most advanced type of state power in the world, Soviet power, while, on the other hand, our industry, which should be the basis of socialism and of Soviet power, is extremely backward technically. Do you think that we can achieve the final victory of socialism in our country so long as this contradiction exists?

> What has to be done to end this contradiction? To end it, we must overtake and outstrip the advanced technology of the developed capitalist countries. We have overtaken and outstripped the advanced capitalist countries in the sense of establishing a new political system, the Soviet system. That is good. But it is not enough. In order to secure the final victory of socialism in our country, we must also overtake and outstrip these countries technically and economically. Either we do this, or we shall be forced to the wall.
>
> This applies not only to the building of socialism. It applies also to upholding the independence of our country in the circumstances of the capitalist encirclement. The independence of our country cannot be upheld unless we have an adequate industrial basis for defense. And such an industrial basis cannot be created if our industry is not more highly developed technically." [26]

Reiterating the possibility of restoration; "the final victory of Socialism, in the sense of full guarantee against the restoration of bourgeois relations, is possible only on an international scale" (9). Meaning the victory of socialism in one country does not guarantee the elimination of restoration, only the Final victory of socialism – defeat of capitalism in world scale can guarantee against the restoration.

Revisionist Views

Revisionist views seek to distort the scientific meaning of socialism and communism, the transition, and the continuing class struggle within and without and to disregard the actual circumstances of that given time. Most revisionist study of the question rests on or borrows from the Trotskyite so called "critique of Soviets which at best is based on economic

determinism that takes the productive forces as primary and politics either as secondary or not important at all. For Marxist-Leninists approach to the question is inseparably connected both economically and politically in which the protection and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the guidance of the Communist Party has tantamount importance.

With their perverted understanding of "socialism" and consciously created confusion between socialism and communism, revisionists proceed from the claim that socialism never existed in Soviet Russia and or could not have been built. With this understanding, bourgeoisie found accomplices in its struggle to restore capitalism within the party in the form of right and left deviations who promoted reckless and irresponsible policies. Right deviation, specifically the Bukharinist revisionists promoted conciliation with the bourgeoisie. The conciliation was to condemn any effort for the elimination of the capitalist classes and capitalist exploitation and to protect the kulak capitalist class in the rural areas and various capitalist elements in urban areas.

Although lately in decreasing number, some Trotskyite variations who claim Lenin to be a revisionist for he introduced the "state capitalism" in Russia, bank on the lack of theoretical knowledge of the masses. It is worth to quote Lenin on the subject which they distort in order to fit their agenda:

> "The restoration of capitalism would mean the restoration of a proletarian class engaged in the production of socially useful material values in big factories employing machinery, and not in profiteering, not in making cigarette-lighters for sale, and in other "work" which is not very useful, but which is inevitable when our industry is in a state of ruin.

> The whole question is who will take the lead. We must face this issue squarely—who will come out on top? Either the capitalists succeed in organising first—in which case they will drive out the Communists and that will be the end of it. Or the proletarian state power, with the support of the peasantry, will prove capable of keeping a proper rein on those gentlemen, the capitalists, so as to direct capitalism along state channels and to create a capitalism that will be subordinate to the state and serve the state. The question must be put soberly." [27]

It is no surprise that the Trotskyist, Ernest Mandel cheered the Krushevite coup after Stalin's death as revolutionary and the restoration as "revolution against the counter revolution" later on, greeted the final collapse, the demolishing of Berlin wall as "the sudden access of hundreds of millions of men and women from the Eastern countries to political life."

CONCLUSION

Readers of the studies concerning the question should understand the fact that unlike capitalism with centuries old history and experience, socialism did not have previous experiences from which to draw lessons.

That is why making "mistakes' were plausible and admitted with self-criticism and followed by correction. The impression that most bourgeois writings in the subject try to give is that as if socialism had so many previous experiences to draw lessons from yet they have made and continued to make mistakes or mistakes are unavoidable due to the fact that socialism inherently does not work. Lenin was clear about the fact that having no previous experiment of socialism trial and error, criticism and self-criticism was utmost important.

"At the beginning of 1918" he said," we expected a period in which peaceful construction would be possible... But we were mistaken, because in 1918 a real military danger overtook us in the shape of the Czechoslovak mutiny and the outbreak of civil war, which dragged on until 1920.... we made the mistake of deciding to go over directly to communist production and distribution. We thought that under the surplus-food appropriation system the peasants would provide us with the required quantity of grain, which we could distribute among the factories and thus achieve communist production and distribution.

I cannot say that we pictured this plan as definitely and as clearly as that; but we acted approximately on those lines. That, unfortunately, is a fact. I say unfortunately, because brief experience convinced us that that line was wrong, that it ran counter to what we had previously written about the transition from capitalism to socialism, namely, that it would be impossible to bypass the period of socialist accounting and control in approaching even the lower stage of communism." [20]

It is not that the Soviet Leaders have not seen and were not aware of the possibility of restoration and have not taken the necessary precautions against it. The effectiveness of the precautions is not measured and the determining factor by itself but depends on the existing concrete conditions and the balance of power between the revolutionary and counter revolutionary forces – which way the internal and external class struggle weighing. As long as the vanguard of the proletariat, the party, is in the hands of Bolsheviks the restoration would be difficult if not impossible without a coup or military intervention. Party would take the necessary precautions against it even if it has to take some steps back to prevent the restoration. So, the core of the question of restoration is related

to the struggle against the right and left deviations within the party, both deviations of which lays the foundation for – the bureaucracy – "a policy in the service of bureaucracy" (13) and the restoration of capitalism.

Unlike the anarchist, revisionist claims" abolishing the bureaucracy at once, everywhere, and completely, is out of the question. It is a utopia. But to smash the old bureaucratic machine at once and to begin immediately to construct a new one that will make possible the gradual abolition of all bureaucracy--this is not a utopia, it is the experience of the Commune, the direct and immediate task of the revolutionary proletariat." (15) This "gradual abolition" may extend till the withering away of the "state" depending on the outcome of class struggle within and without. "The economic foundations for the withering away of the state", Lenin sys, "in this case we also have the "economic foundations" for the withering away of bureaucracy..." (16)

Each and every other aspect of the question is dialectically connected and stems from the class struggle in general and class struggle within the party in particular. Denying that and or isolating one specific aspect of the question from this fact would not be objective at best, would serve the interests of revisionist at worse.

As history has proven, socialism, even in its early stages, the less developed one, despite all the attacks and blockades of imperialists, does not fail – at least in its primary, minimal objectives – but can only be defeated.

Notes and Related Articles to Read

(1) Stalin, On the Final Victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.

(2) Lenin, 8th Party Congress

(3) Hıdır Yesil," The Question of Restoration in Socialism"

(4) Moscow Court Proceedings

(5) Vyshinsky, Court Proceedings

(6) Lenin, The Proletarian Revolution, and the Renegade Kautsky,"

(7) Lenin, Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder

(8) Lenin, Plan of The Pamphlet, The Tax in Kind

(9) Resolution of the Fourteenth Conference of the CPSU

(10) Stalin, Grain Procurements, and the Prospects for the Development of Agriculture

(11) Stalin, The Results of the First Five-Year Plan

(12) Lenin, Preliminary Draft of Theses on the Agrarian Question

(13) Lenin, Notes for a Speech at the 10th Congress

(14) Lenin, State and Revolution, presentation of question by Marx

(15) Lenin, State and Revolution

(16) Lenin, Plan of The Pamphlet, The Tax in Kind

(17) Stalin, Reply to Comrade Sh.- P168

(18) Stalin, to Kaganovich and Molotov – P166

(19) Stalin, The Foundation of Leninism – P 171

(20) Education Departments – P27

(21) Lenin, Speech in Defense of The Tactics of The Communist International – P59

(22) Lenin, Speech At A Plenary Session The Moscow Soviet

(23) Stalin, Concerning Questions of Leninism – P94

(24) Committee and Central Control Commission – P252

(25) Lenin, Can There Be Equality Between the Exploited and the Exploiter?)

(26) Stalin, Industrialization of the country and the Right Deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.) – P211

(27) Lenin, The New Economic Policy and The Tasks of The Political Committee on The Role of The Peasantry – P28

(28) Lenin, Third Congress of The Communist International – P49

Lenin, Report on The Tactics of The R.C.P. – P71

Lenin, From: Tenth All-Russian Conference of the R.C.P.(B.) - P92

Lenin, Speech at A Plenary Session of The Moscow Soviet – P350

Lenin, The 1918 Decision of The All-Russia Central Executive

Stalin, Interview with Foreign Workers' Delegations – P185

Stalin, Questions & Answers to American Trade Unionists – P187

Stalin, The Work of the April Joint Plenum of the Central

Enver Hoxha, The Demagogy of the Soviet Revisionists Cannot

Conceal Their Traitorous Countenance – P286

Enver Hoxha, Euro Communism is Anti- Communism – P324

Enver Hoxha, Imperialism, and the Revolution – P328

H. Mara, Revisionist “Theories” of Restored Capitalism – P330

On The Right to Self determination

"Does recognition of the right of nations to self-determination really imply support of any demand of every nation for self-determination? After all, the fact that we recognize the right of all citizens to form free associations does not at all commit us"" (1)

The right and demand to self determination

The largest confusion related to Marxist Leninist fundamental theories have been about the theory of "State", "Defense of fatherland", and the "Right to Self-determination", therefore eclectic approach has been widely applied by all sides concerned; eclecticism of bourgeois Liberals, chauvinists, nationalists, and opportunistic ML tailgaters, inevitably continued to blur the subject and related confusion.

Taking the internationalist unity of the workers and oppressed people as the basic principle, Marxist-Leninist "Right to Self-determination" theory, counter-aims the cynical purpose of the bourgeoisie. Thus, the Importance of this theory should not be underestimated. Because this theory, to counter the bourgeois approach, has both theoretical and tactical content.

Stalin states;

> The merits of this slogan are that it:
>
> Removes all grounds for suspicion that the toilers of one nation entertain predatory designs against the toilers of another nation, and therefore creates a basis for mutual confidence and voluntary union;
>
> 1) Tears the mask from the imperialists, who hypocritically prate about self-determination but who are striving to keep the unequal peoples and colonies in subjection, to retain them within the framework of their

> imperialist state, and thereby intensifies the struggle for liberation that these nations and colonies are waging against imperialism. (2)

Due to the tactical nature of the theory, if and when the approach to the theory is partial, not to the entire context, it will inevitably be perceived as contradictory. Tweezing this "dual - contradictory content" will bring about the practical and “pseudo-right" results in accord with one’s own ideological understanding and purpose.

The Conflicting Appearance

When we carefully read the writings of Lenin on the Right to Self-determination, what strikes the eye first, is that Lenin's comments appear to be conflicting duality.

On the one hand Lenin and Stalin, while making an internationalist obligation to defend "The Right to Self-determination", on the other hand they indicate that the realization of this right could only be by a socialist revolution.

These examples of citations are related to the self-determination RIGHTS that we often see and read.

> "" Whoever..... does not fight against all national oppression or inequality, is not a Marxist; he is not even a democrat "" (3)
>
> "A nation has the right freely to determine its own destiny. It has the right to arrange its life as it sees fit, without, of course, trampling on the rights of other nations. That is beyond dispute." (4)
>
> ""...there is one case in which the Marxists are duty bound, if they do not want to betray democracy and the proletariat, to defend one special demand in the

> national question; that is, the right of nations to self-determination, i.e., the right to political secession.'" (5)

On the other hand, this excerpt of the Self-Determination of Nations' transformation to an active DEMAND appears to be contradictory;

> " .... the revolutionary experience of recent years has again confirmed that: the national and colonial questions are inseparable from the question of emancipation from the rule of capital; ..... the unequal nations and colonies cannot be liberated without overthrowing the rule of capital;"" (6)

> "the Communist International's entire policy on the national and the colonial questions should rest primarily on a closer union of the proletarians and the working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie. This union alone will guarantee victory over capitalism, without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible." (7)

So, there has to be a theoretic and practical difference between defending and promoting the RIGHT and its transformation into agenda as DEMAND, since the first is absolute for socialism and latter, leaded by other classes, may contradict the interests of working class. For Marxists, the interests of working class and its struggle cannot be subordinated to any other class and its struggle. Here the question arises.

Stalin summarizes this "duality", "contradiction":

> "while not contradicting the rights of these nations, do contradict "the precise meaning" of the programme"""", meaning the demand for secession. ""Obviously, "the rights of nations" and the "precise meaning" of the

> programme are on two entirely different planes. Whereas the "precise meaning" of the programme expresses the interests of the proletariat, as scientifically formulated in the programme of the latter, the rights of nations may express the interests of any class – bourgeoisie, aristocracy, clergy, etc. – depending on the strength and influence of these classes. On the one hand are the duties of Marxists, on the other the rights of nations, which consist of various classes. "" (8)

Attitude to the "Right and to the actual "Demand"

Marxist Leninists always defend and support the RIGHT. This constitutes the essence of the tactical theory, but when the actual DEMAND comes to the agenda, an approach to support the DEMAND at any cost, is contradictory to the soul and to the fundamental theories of Marxism Leninism. It would be a bourgeois approach to support and defend a DEMAND without assessing its impact on working class. Marxist Leninists have to assess the specific conditions, and their practice should be in the interests of laboring people and of their struggle. This fundamental approach is never rendered secondary to any democratic demands.

As Lenin explains;

> .... our unreserved recognition of the struggle for freedom of self-determination does not in any way commit us to supporting every demand for national self-determination. As the party of the proletariat, the Social-Democratic Party considers it to be its positive and principal task to further the self-determination of the proletariat in each nationality rather than that of peoples or nations. We must always and unreservedly work for the very closest unity of the proletariat of all nationalities"" (1)

Lenin clarifies the distinction between Marxist and Bourgeois approach to the question;

> ""In contrast to the petty-bourgeois democrats, Marx regarded every democratic demand without exception not as an absolute, but as an historical expression of the struggle of the masses of the people, led by the bourgeoisie, against feudalism. There is not one of these demands which could not serve and has not served, under certain circumstances, as an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie for deceiving the workers. To single out, in this respect, one of the demands of political democracy, specifically the self determination of nations, and to oppose it to the rest, is fundamentally wrong in theory. In practice, the proletariat can retain its independence only by subordinating its struggle for all democratic demands, not excluding the demand for a republic, to its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. "" "(9)

The RIGHT to Self Determination

İf in a reactionary society where a woman is not entitled to any saying at all, where women has no right to divorce, yet men can divorce her with just one word, “divorced", the RIGHT to divorce for women must be defended , same way , the RIGHT of a nation to secede should be defended, in all circumstances. The RIGHT that the women would win, is for free, voluntary association and distinct from forcible association. The most important difference not being understood is to defend and support the RIGHT to divorce, and to propose and support the actual DEMAND of divorce.

Lenin while criticizing Semkovsky states;

> "It would seem that even with Mr. Semkovsky’s mental abilities it is not difficult to deduce that “the right to

> divorce" does not require that one should vote for divorce! But such is the fate of those who criticize -they forget the ABC of logic. "" (10)

Theory speaks of the RIGHT and the DEMAND differently;

> ""our programme (on the self-determination of nations) cannot be interpreted to mean anything but political self-determination, i.e., the right to secede and form a separate state " (11)

and explains the reasons clearly;

> "The championing of this right, far from encouraging the formation of small states, leads, on the contrary, to the freer, fearless and therefore wider and more widespread formation of very big states and federations of states, which are more beneficial for the masses and more fully in keeping with economic development." (12)

So, the championed RIGHT is not one suggesting the separation, but one tactical support theory that is aimed at freely formation of the association. Because, as noted below, anti-imperialist, and socialist struggle is the current agenda.

> Since capitalism is the beginning of the nations, inevitably, there are two historic periods to the right of Nations Self-determination. ""The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states So "the awakening of national life and national movements and the creation of national states", bourgeois national movements,""(13) Second period ", a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society"
>
> (13) corresponds to the imperialist era.

Lenin explains the dual approach and purpose;

> " The Marxists' national programme takes both tendencies into account, and advocates, firstly, the equality of nations and languages and the impermissibility of all privileges in this respect ....; secondly, the principle of internationalism and uncompromising struggle against contamination of the proletariat with bourgeois nationalism, even of the most refined kind.. "" (13)
>
> "the main thing today is to stand against the united, aligned front of the imperialist powers, the imperialist bourgeoisie and the social imperialists, and for the utilization of all national movements against imperialism for the purposes of the socialist revolution " (14)

If we want to stay true to the tactical nature of the theory, in this period too, the RIGHT must be supported in all circumstances. Lenin emphasizes that this RIGHT should be recognized even in the most adverse conditions.

> "The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations persistently utilize the slogans of national liberation to deceive the workers.

The fact that the struggle for national liberation against one imperialist power may, under certain conditions, be utilized by another "great" power for its own, equally imperialist, aims, is just as unlikely to make the Social Democrats refuse to recognize the right of nations to self-determination as the numerous cases of bourgeois utilization of republican slogans for the purpose of political deception and financial plunder are unlikely to make the Social-Democrats reject their republicanism" (15)

(We have seen articles trying to pass theoretical sheath for the cooperation with imperialists, especially in Syria, by the writers' eclecticism where the words “against an imperialist power " is deleted.)

On the extent and limit of support, or what is to be supported at what degree, and with what precautions Lenin states;

> "Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism, be it even of the “most just”, “purest”, most refined, and civilized brand..... The principle of nationality is historically inevitable in bourgeois society and, taking this society into due account, the Marxist fully recognizes the historical legitimacy of national movements. But to prevent this recognition from becoming an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness."" (16)

When the DEMAND to secede is on the agenda

Confusion and problem arise when the RIGHT comes to the actual agenda as DEMAND. These words of Lenin below, clarifies that the decision to an actual DEMAND should be depending on the outcome of the evaluation of concrete conditions. And he emphasizes that it should be based on the interests of the struggle of the laboring people. Marxist Leninists cannot say "yes" or "no" to an actual DEMAND before making an assessment guarding the interests of the working class and her struggle.

> "" Does recognition of the right of nations to self-determination really imply support of any demand of every nation for self-determination? After all, the fact that we recognize the right of all citizens to form free associations does not at all commit us, Social

> Democrats, to supporting the formation of any new association; nor does it prevent us from opposing and campaigning against the formation of a given association as an inexpedient and unwise step. We even recognize the right of the Jesuits to carry on agitation freely, "" (17)
>
> ""In conformity with its fundamental task of combating bourgeois democracy and exposing its falseness and hypocrisy, the Communist Party, as the avowed champion of the proletarian struggle to overthrow the bourgeois yoke, must base its policy, in the national question too, not on abstract and formal principles but, first, on a precise appraisal of the specific historical situation "'
>
> ""the need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practiced by the imperialist powers, which, under the guise of politically independent states, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially, and militarily."" (18)

In reference to being "practical" and saying "yes" or "no",

Lenin's criticism of Rosa's approach touches the core of the subject; ""

> "What does the demand for “practicality” in the national question mean?
>
> ""It means one of three things: support for all national aspirations; the answer “yes” or “no” to the question of secession by any nation; or that national demands are in general immediately “practicable”.

The bourgeoisie, which naturally assumes the leadership at the start of every national movement, says that support for all national aspirations is practical. However, the proletariat's policy in the national question (as in all others) supports the bourgeoisie only in a certain direction, but it never coincides with the bourgeoisie's policy. The working class supports the bourgeoisie only in order to secure national peace (which the bourgeoisie cannot bring about completely, and which can be achieved only with complete democracy), in order to secure equal rights and to create the best conditions for the class struggle. Therefore, it is in opposition to the practicality of the bourgeoisie that the proletarians advance their principles in the national question; they always give the bourgeoisie only conditional support. What every bourgeoisie is out for in the national question is either privileges for its own nation, or exceptional advantages for it; this is called being "practical". The proletariat is opposed to all privileges, to all exclusiveness. To demand that it should be "practical" means following the lead of the bourgeoisie, falling into opportunism.

The bourgeoisie is most of all interested in the "feasibility" of a given demand—hence the invariable policy of coming to terms with the bourgeoisie of other nations, to the detriment of the proletariat. For the proletariat, however, the important thing is to strengthen its class against the bourgeoisie and to educate the masses in the spirit of consistent democracy and socialism.

This may not be "practical" as far as the opportunists are concerned, but it is the only real guarantee, the guarantee of the greater national equality and peace,

> despite the feudal landlords and the nationalist bourgeoisie.
>
> The whole task of the proletarians in the national question is "unpractical" from the standpoint of the nationalist bourgeoisie of every nation, because the proletarians, opposed as they are to nationalism of every kind, demand "abstract" equality; they demand, as a matter of principle, that there should be no privileges, however slight.
>
> On the plea that its demands are "practical", the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations will call upon the proletariat to support its aspirations unconditionally. The most practical procedure is to say a plain "yes" in favor of the secession of a particular nation rather than in favor of all nations having the right to secede!
>
> The proletariat is opposed to such practicality. While recognizing equality and equal rights to a national state, it values above all and places foremost the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and assesses any national demand, any national separation, from the angle of the workers' class struggle. This call for practicality is in fact merely a call for uncritical acceptance of bourgeois aspirations. (19)

Lenin outlines most clearly this difference between the RIGHT and the DEMAND and the cause for the rejection of demand;

> "The several demands of democracy, including self-determination, are not an absolute, but only a small part of the general-democratic (now: general-socialist) world movement. In individual concrete cases, the part may contradict the whole; if so, it must be rejected. It is possible that the republican movement in one country may be merely an instrument of the clerical or financial

> monarchist intrigues of other countries; if so, we must not support this particular, concrete movement, but it would be ridiculous to delete the demand for a republic from the programme of international Social-Democracy on these grounds." (20)

In this citation Lenin talks about DEMAND being not absolute, chauvinists cite this as for the RIGHT being not absolute.

The conditions for the DEMAND to be supported can be summarized in the following quotes where he emphasizes the quality over quantity;

> " it is not so much a question of the size of an organization, as of the real, objective significance of its policy: does its policy represent the masses, does it serve them, i.e., does it aim at their liberation from capitalism, or does it represent the interests of the minority, the minority's reconciliation with capitalism? "" (21)

> A national (ist) movement could be very strong with thousands of followers, yet for ML what matter is its policy and practice in regard to its relationship with the capitalism and imperialism. Lenin states that movements seeking exclusive rights to his own bourgeoisie against the other bourgeoisie would not be supported.

> If it is not through the revolution, as an alternative leaving in a peaceful manner Lenin indicates that it is reactionary... In the words of Lenin "separation through legislation from a minority of the other is a reactionary idea." (22)

Tactical content summarized

Tactical content and importance of Lenin's Right to Self-determination theory can be summarized in two ways.

1 - The right to self-determination theory, based on the principles of Marxism and internationalism, is the theory of the practice of providing voluntary merger rather than by force and repression.

Lenin summarizes this tactical approach as following;

> "" If, in our political agitation, we fail to advance and advocate the slogan of the right to secession, we shall play into the hands, not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of the feudal landlords and the absolutism of the oppressor nation..."(23)

He explains the essence of the theory and reasons;

> "" If we demand freedom of secession for ... all other oppressed and unequal nations without exception, we do so not because we favor secession, but only because we stand for free, voluntary association and merging as distinct from forcible association. That is the only reason! ""
>
> "....no self-respecting Social-Democrat will consider anyone opposing the right of divorce a democrat, let alone a socialist. That is the crux of the matter. All "democracy" consists in the proclamation and realization of "rights" which under capitalism are realizable only to a very small degree and only relatively. But without the proclamation of these rights, without a struggle to introduce them now, immediately, without training the masses in the spirit of this struggle, socialism is impossible. (24)
>
> 2 -National movements force the ruling classes to decide on problems
>
> Lenin explains this tactical approach as following;

"" The right to self-determination" implies a democratic system of a type in which there is not only democracy in general, but specifically one in which there could not be an undemocratic solution of the question of secession. .....When a democratic vote gives the reactionaries a majority, one of two things may, and usually does occur: either the decision of the reactionaries is implemented and its harmful consequences send the masses more or less speedily over to the side of democracy and against the reactionaries; or the conflict between democracy and reaction is decided by a civil or other war, which is also quite possible under a democracy..."" (25)

In short, Marxist theory of Right to Self Determination is a theory that weight tactical content.

On the Attitude of Marxists from each side

Always keep in mind "" Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the two policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question..." "(26)

In terms of the defense of Right, on Marxists general attitude;

"Social-Democracy, therefore, must give most emphatic warning to the proletariat and other working people of all nationalities against direct deception by the nationalistic slogans of "their own" bourgeoisie." (27)

"Those who seek to serve the proletariat must unite the workers of all nations, and unswervingly fight bourgeois nationalism, domestic and foreign. ." (28)

On the oppressor nations Marxist-Leninist attitude;

> "" the Great-Russian Marxist (oppressor nation's Marxist EA) will be bogged down, not only in bourgeois, but also in Black-Hundred nationalism, if he loses sight, even for a moment, of the demand for complete equality for the Ukrainians (oppressed nations') , or of their right to forum an independent state.." "(29)

On the oppressed nations Marxists attitude;

> "workers who place political unity with "their own" bourgeoisie above complete unity with the proletariat of all nations, are acting against their own interests, against the interests of socialism and against the interests of democracy." (30)
>
> "If a Ukrainian Marxist (Marxist of oppressed nation) allows himself to be swayed by his quite legitimate and natural hatred of the Great Russian oppressors to such a degree that he transfers even a particle of this hatred, even if it be only estrangement, to the proletarian culture and proletarian cause of the Great-Russian workers, then such a Marxist will get bogged down in bourgeois nationalism. "" (31)

Risk of wrong approach

Wrong approach to the theory, -as the condition of the current revolutionary struggle in Turkey is the sad historical example of this - will end up as " an apologia of nationalism and will lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness", create division, hostility, and hatred among the laboring masses of given country.

The approach and attitudes to the Right to self-determination cannot be identical to the DEMAND for secession. The decision to support or not the DEMAND for secession depends on the evaluation of the specific conditions in relation to the interests of the working class and the socialist struggle at that given time. If this fundamental approach is ignored, the theory of the Right to Self-determination, becomes the bourgeois theory of content. In Lenin's words;

> ""Self-determination of nations demand that's it (the working class) we must subordinate the interests of the struggle. The national question in our attitude to our bourgeois-democratic attitude of the difference precisely lies in these circumstances "" (32)

> " It is beyond doubt that any national movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, since the overwhelming mass of the population in the backward countries consist of peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relationships. It would be utopian to believe that proletarian parties in these backward countries, if indeed they can emerge in them, can pursue communist tactics and a communist policy, without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without giving it effective support. However, the objections have been raised that, if we speak of the bourgeois democratic movement, we shall be obliterating all distinctions between the reformist and the revolutionary movements. Yet that distinction has been very clearly revealed of late in the backward and colonial countries, since the imperialist bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to implant a reformist movement among the oppressed nations too. There has been a certain rapprochement between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and that of the colonies, so

> that very often—perhaps even in most cases—the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, while it does support the national movement, is in full accord with the imperialist bourgeoisie, i.e., joins forces with it against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes. This was irrefutably proved in the commission, and we decided that the only correct attitude was to take this distinction into account and, in nearly all cases, substitute the term "national-revolutionary" for the term "bourgeois-democratic". The significance of this change is that we, as Communists, should and will support bourgeois-liberation movements in the colonies only when they are genuinely revolutionary, and when their exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organizing in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the masses of the exploited. If these conditions do not exist, the Communists in these countries must combat the reformist bourgeoisie. "" (33)

Conclusion

Theory cannot be taken independent from the class struggle, as an absolute theory by itself, especially as an empty slogan without content. To defend and support the RIGHT and to defend and promote DEMAND has different contents.

" If viewed from the Marxist angle," as Lenin said," and if the slogans are compared with the interests and policies of classes, and not with meaningless "general principles" ""we should approach the theory" from the standpoint of the class struggle" (34)

In this sense, the Right to Self Determination theory should NOT be understood in a theoretical and practical context where the interests of class struggle are subordination and dependent. On the contrary, parts and related theories, should be subjected

to the subordination for the interests of the working class. Otherwise it cannot be Marxism but would be bourgeois conciliation and bourgeois tailing.

Lenin puts it in concrete terms;

> "" The national cause comes first and the proletarian cause second, the bourgeois nationalists say, with the Yurkeviches, Dontsovs and similar would-be Marxists repeating it after them. The proletarian cause must come first, we say, because it not only protects the lasting and fundamental interests of labor and of humanity, but also those of democracy.....without democracy neither an autonomous nor an independent (nation is conceivable. "" (35)

In these days seeing widespread examples of opportunist nationalist movement tailgating (especially in Turkey) these words of Lenin must be digested;

> "“But we cannot be in favor of a war between great nations, in favor of the slaughter of twenty million people for the sake of the problematical liberation of a small nation with a population of perhaps ten or twenty millions!” Of course not! And it does not mean that we throw complete national equality out of our Programme; it means that the democratic interests of one country must be subordinated to the democratic interests of several and all countries. “(36)

These two quotes above and below are crucially important in current situation where the DEMAND for secession in Syria is on the agenda. Even we are against the DEMAND, it emphasizes the need to be opposed to any would be active action against the demand taken by the bourgeoisie.

> "be unconditionally hostile to the use of force in any form whatsoever by the dominant nation (or the nation which constitutes the majority of the population) in respect of a nation that wishes to secede politically"" (37)
>
> "The Social-Democrats will always combat every attempt to influence national self-determination from without by violence or by any injustice. However, our unreserved recognition of the struggle for freedom of self-determination does not in any way commit us to supporting every demand for national self-determination." (38)

So, while the RIGHT to Self Determination is supported in any event, as Lenin states "" a Marxist can recognize the DEMAND for national independence only conditionally, namely, on the condition indicated above" (which is subject to proletarian struggle) ... But it is to the interests of this struggle that we must subordinate the demand for national self-determination.

"It is this that makes all the difference between our approach to the national question and the bourgeois-democratic approach. The bourgeois democrat (and the present-day socialist opportunist who follows in his footsteps) imagines that democracy eliminates the class struggle, and that is why he presents all his political demands in an abstract way, lumped together, "without reservations," from the standpoint of the interests of the "whole people," or even from that of an eternal and absolute moral principle. Always and everywhere the Social-Democrat ruthlessly exposes this bourgeois illusion, whether it finds expression in an abstract idealist philosophy or in an absolute demand for national independence."" (38)

""In contrast to the petty-bourgeois democrats, Marx regarded every democratic demand without exception not as an absolute"" one. Every democratic demand, including the right

to self-determination is secondary to the interests of working class and her struggle. While we defend and support the RIGHT to self-determination, we do not say "yes" to every actual DEMAND to secede without assessing the concrete situation with the interest of working class in mind.

Stalin clearly states this approach on "Foundation of Leninism;

> "Leninism .. recognizes the existence of revolutionary capacities in the national liberation movement of the oppressed countries, and the possibility of using these for overthrowing the common enemy, for overthrowing imperialism
>
> This does not mean, of course, that the proletariat must support every national movement, everywhere and always, in every individual concrete case. It means that support must be given to such national movements as tend to weaken, to overthrow imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it. Cases occur when the national movements in certain oppressed countries come into conflict with the interests of the development of the proletarian movement. In such cases support is, of course, entirely out of the question. The question of the rights of nations is not an isolated, self-sufficient question; it is a part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, subordinate to the whole, and must be considered from the point of view of the whole." (39)

""no Marxist, without renouncing the principles of Marxism and of socialism generally, can deny that the interests of socialism are higher than the interests of the right of nations to self-determination." *Lenin, On The History Of The Question Of The Unfortunate Peace*

Notes and related Articles to Read

(1) Lenin, The National Question in Our Programme

(2) Stalin, Concerning the Presentation of the National Question

(3) Lenin, The nationalist Bogey of "Assimilation"

(4) Stalin, Marxism, and the National Question - Nation

(5) Lenin, The National Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.

(6) Stalin, Concerning the Presentation of the National Question

(7) Lenin, Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions

(8) Stalin, The Caucasians, The Conference Of The Liquidators

(9) Lenin, Socialist Revolution, and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination

(10) Lenin, The National Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.

(11) Lenin, Theses on the national question

(12) Lenin, Socialism and War The Attitude of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party Towards the War

(13) Lenin, Nationalist Bogey of assimilation

(14) Lenin, Marxism or Proudhonism? The Discussion On Self-Determination Summed Up

(15) Lenin, Socialist Revolution, and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination

(16) Lenin, Cultural national Autonomy - Critical Remarks on the National Question

(17) Lenin, The National Question in Our Programme

(18) Lenin, Draft Theses on National and Colonial Questions

(19) Lenin, Practicality on National Question

(20) Lenin, Socialism, and the self determination of nations - Marxism or Proudhonism?

(21) Lenin, Imperialism, and the Split in Socialism

(22) Lenin, Socialism and War The Attitude of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party Towards the War

(23)Lenin, Practicality on National Question

(24) Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism -The Other Political Issues

(25) Lenin, The National Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.

(26) Lenin, National Culture

(27) Lenin, Theses on the national question

(28) Lenin, National Culture

(29) Lenin, Nationalist Bogey of assimilation

(30) Lenin, Theses on the national question

(31) Lenin, Nationalist Bogey of assimilation

(32) Lenin, The National Question in Our Programme

(33) Lenin, Report Of The Commission On The National And Colonial Questions,

(34) Lenin, National Culture

(35) Lenin Nationalist Bogey of assimilation

(36) Lenin The Discussion On Self-Determination Summed Up - Marxism or Proudhonism?

(37) Lenin, Theses on the national question

(38) Lenin The National Question in Our Programme

(39) Stalin, The Foundation of Leninism

On National Question and Bundists

National Question whether it be in general -between countries- or in particular within a nation-state cannot be taken and studied without the question of nationalism -nationalist ideology.

The question of the right of nations to determine their own fate has been taken up extensively by Lenin and Stalin, articles for which has been compiled in the book "Lenin on the Right to Self-Determination" which is summarized in the introduction section. Although the articles touch base with the issue of "nationalist ideology" and contain "warnings" for it, the question has been dealt with in so many articles in connection with other issues. The only directly related to the issue of "nationalism" in specific has been the articles about the "Bundists".

In most cases the articles related to the right to self-determination concentrated on the `national Liberation movements` and the attitude towards them. Marxist Leninist parties and movements have been the secondary issue except that of Bundizm related articles.

Considering the undeniable fact of "nationalism" in disguise appears in various Marxist Leninist parties and movements which clouds the working class ideology and effectively divides and builds an ethnic wall hindering their unity, it has been imperative to compile the writings and speeches specifically related to "Bundist" since quite some parties and movements give lip service to the theory but act like "Bundists" in deed- especially in Turkey. (My commentary will be based on the developments in Turkey)

Looking at the history of Russia, it is clear that The Bund brought nationalism and separatism into the Russian working-class movement and took an opportunist stand on the most

important issues of the socialist movement. Typical Bundist stands are being taken in our days in most issues on the current agenda for example the struggle against the fascist dictatorship or autocracy rather than acting " as a single and centralised militant organisation with the whole of the proletariat without distinction of language or nationality, "and struggling against the autocracy, against the bourgeoisie as a whole, separation of working class by ethnicity is being promoted not only in theory in some cases, but in practice as a whole. Opportunism, Liberalism and tailism in various degrees influences the theory and practice of parties and organizations and prevails in any stand at any given time or subject; practice is determined not based on the application of theories to the conditions and situations for the benefit of laboring masses and their struggle in mind, but theories have been revised and/or invented to justify the "nationalist" practices. The most important of which is being the separation of working class by ethnicity, in some cases, childishly and illogically fabricating a statistics showing the "working class" of oppressor nation as "minimal" and thus coming to the conclusion that "that portion of working class is irrelevant", but the "working class" of oppressed nation is relevant and since the current agenda for that nation is "national liberation", struggle embraces the "whole ethnic group" as an homogenic one – a blunt nationalist view dressed with Marxist Leninist ingredients.

It would be beneficial to go back to the history and see the mirror images of past in present;

> "The Bund (The General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia) came into being in 1897 at the founding Congress of Jewish Social-Democratic groups in Vilna. In the main, it comprised semi-proletarian Jewish artisans in the west of Russia. At the First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. in 1898, the Bund joined

> the latter "as an autonomous organisation, independent only in respect of questions affecting the Jewish proletariat specifically". *(The C.P.S.U. in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee, Russ. ed., Moscow 1954, Part 1, p. 14.)*

Such an approach that the questions affecting a specific ethnic proletariat requires an autonomous organisation - although not as much in theory but- in practice is widely defended and being carried out- which in Lenin's point of view is an expression of nationalism and separatism.

> "The Bund was an expression of nationalism and separatism in the Russian working-class movement. In April 1901, the Bund's Fourth Congress decided to alter the organisational ties with the R.S.D.L.P., as established by the latter's First Congress. In its resolution, the Bund Congress declared that It regarded the R.S.D.L.P. as a federation of national, organisations, and that the Bund should enter the R.S.D.L.P. as a federal section. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. turned down the Bund's demand that it should be recognised the sole representative of the Jewish proletariat, the Bund left the Party, but rejoined it in 1906 on the basis of a decision of the Fourth (Unity) Congress. (1)

We have witnessed similar demands made in different forms and under different disguises with varying revised and fabricated theories, some still reigns within some parties and organisations although most dissolvement, separations and new ones along these lines have been a result for the last 30 years or so.

Within the R.S.D.L.P. the Bund constantly supported the Party's opportunist wing (the Economists, Mensheviks, and Liquidators), and waged a struggle against Bolshevism and the Bolsheviks. To the latter's programmatic demand for the right of nations to self-determination the Bund contraposed the demand for autonomy of national culture. While the Stolypin reaction was raging, the Bund took a liquidationist stand, and was active in the formation of the August anti-Party bloc. During the First World War the Bundists held a social-chauvinist stand, and in 1917 they supported the counter-revolutionary Provisional Government and sided with the enemies of the Great October Socialist Revolution. During the foreign military intervention and the Civil War the Bund's leaders made common cause with the forces of counter-revolution. Meanwhile there was a turn among the Bund's rank and file for collaboration with the Soviets. In March 1921, the Bund decided to dissolve itself, part of the membership joined the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on the basis of the general rules of admission." (2)

As it was an inseparable history of Bolshevism in Russia, it has become an ongoing history of Bolshevism in Turkey. Let's look at the history of Bolshevism in her struggle against the "Bundizm" and its supporter "economism" as a mirror to last 50 years history of Turkey;

"The origin of Bolshevism is inseparably linked with the struggle of what is known as Economism (opportunism which rejected the political struggle of the working class and denied the latter's leading role) against revolutionary Social-Democracy in 1897–1902. Economism, supported by the Bund, was defeated, and eliminated by the well-known campaign of the old Iskra (Munich, London, and Geneva, 1900–03), which restored the Social-Democratic Party (founded in 1898 but later destroyed by arrests) on the basis of Marxism and

revolutionary Social-Democratic principles. At the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (August 1903), the Iskrists split: the majority stood for the principles and tactics of the old Iskra, while the minority turned to opportunism, and was backed by the one-time enemies of Iskra, the Economists and the Bundists. Hence the terms Bolshevism and Menshevism (Bolsheviks and Mensheviks).

In 1903–04 the struggle was mainly over the Mensheviks' opportunism in questions of organisation. From the end of 1904 on, tactical differences became the most important. The "plan for the Zemstvo campaign" put forward (Autumn 1904) by the new Iskra, which had deserted to the Mensheviks, took up the defence of the tactics of "not intimidating the liberals".

The year 1905 saw the tactical differences take final shape (the Bolshevik Congress, Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. in London, May 1905, and the Menshevik "conference" held in Geneva at the same time). The Mensheviks strove to adapt working-class tactics to liberalism. The Bolsheviks, however, put forward as the aim of the working class in the bourgeois-democratic revolution: to carry it through to the end and to lead the democratic peasantry despite the treachery of the liberals. The main practical divergencies between the two trends in the autumn of 1905 were over the fact that the Bolsheviks stood for boycotting the Bulygin Duma while the Mensheviks favored participation.

In the spring of 1906, the same thing happened with regard to the Witte Duma. First Duma: the Mensheviks stood for the slogan of a Duma (Cadet) Ministry; the Bolsheviks, for the slogan of a Left (Social-Democratic and Trudovik) Executive Committee that would organise the actual struggle of the masses, etc... At the Stockholm Congress (1906) the Mensheviks won the upper hand, and at the London Congress (1907), the Bolsheviks.

In 1908–09 the Vperyod group (Machism] in philosophy and otzovism, or boycotting the Third Duma, in politics— Bogdanov, Alexinsky, Lunacharsky and others) broke away from the Bolsheviks.

In 1909-11, in fighting against them (Lenin, Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, 1909), as well as against the liquidators (Mensheviks who denied the need for an illegal Party), Bolshevism came close to the pro-Party Mensheviks (Plekhanov and others), who had declared a resolute war on liquidationism." (3)

During late 1970s and up to early 1990s it was not so much different that of Russia in essence against the "nationalists" , or better, against those Marxist Leninists who could not rid themselves off their ethnic subjectivity. Referring back;

> "Formally, I think, our attitude to the Bund should be studiously correct (not hitting straight in the teeth), but at the same time icily cold, buttoned up to the neck, and on legitimate grounds we should press hard against the Bund relentlessly and all the time, going right to the end without being afraid. Let them get out, if they want to, but we should not give them the slightest occasion, the shadow of an excuse, for a break. We must, of course, observe the formalities prior to the Congress, but there is no point in showing our cards. You write: Bundist knows we are working for Iskra but keeps silent, although we have no right to do so in the name of the O.C. In my opinion, this should not be done from the O.C. but from each member personally, referring not to the O.C., but to the committees which have recognised Iskra. The result is the same and even much stronger (there are no "agents"), and the formal aspect is

> irreproachable. Preparing the committees against the Bund is one of the most important tasks of the present moment, and it, too, is fully possible without any violation of form. (4)

Opportunism, nationalism, and to some degree social-chauvinism have become the trend and with eclectic, revised theories the root causes of dissolvements, separations and forming ”new ” parties and organisations during 1990s and onward. Referring back;

> “The inane idea of the necessity of forming an International of ‘internationalist Social-Democrats’ .., [of] opposition elements picked at random from all the socialist parties .... The International can be restored only from the same elements it has consisted of till now .... A restored International will not be the ‘third’ in succession, as is desired by a handful of sectarians and experts in the business of arranging splits, but the selfsame Second International, which has not died, but has been temporarily paralyzed by a world disaster....”
>
> This is what Mr. V. Kosovsky writes in issue No. 8 of the Bund’s Information Bulletin. We are deeply thankful for the frankness shown by this Bundist, who is not the brightest of the lot. This is not the first time he has defended opportunism with an outspokenness that must be displeasing to the Bund’s diplomatists. This time again, he will be helping the struggle against opportunism, by revealing to the workers how hopelessly far the Bund stands from proletarian socialism. Mr. V. Kosovsky does not see the link between opportunism and social-chauvinism. To discern that link, one must be able to ask oneself the following questions: what are the fundamental ideas in the two currents? How has opportunism developed in

> Europe during the last few decades? What is the attitude towards social-chauvinism revealed by the opportunist and the revolutionary wing in, a number of European countries, as, for instance, in Russia, Germany, Belgium, France, Britain, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, Holland, and Bulgaria? " (5)

During 1990s, except few individual voices- some had to leave and chosen to be non-party as a result- , not even one party or movement raised its voice and dared to do so for fear and chosen opportunism.

> "Be stricter with the Bund! Be stricter, too, in writing to the Bund and Rabocheye Dyelo abroad, reducing their function to such a minimum that in any case it cannot be of importance." *(6)*

As a result while some played at the center and chosen opportunism, others concentrated on "national issue", helped bourgeoisie in its struggle to divide the working class for the purpose of weakening her and let the "nationalism" reign and cloud the working class conscious with it. Referring back;

> "For a long time it has of course been no secret to the Party that a group of liquidators has been trying to call a conference with the assistance of the Bund, which has essentially nothing to do with actual Russian Social-Democratic activity. (For the information of German readers let us add that when we speak about Russian Party work the Bund is not included because its sphere of activity is confined exclusively to the Jewish proletariat. " (7)

And " internationalism" converted in to "national question" at large rather than "socialist" one in particular. İt is not a coincidence though that the US and EU NGO funds and support have been used for translations and promotions of this

"conversion". (Only to look at the "supporters" stated on their web sites would be sufficient evidence to that fact.) The issue of "socialism " or " socialist struggle" was replaced -or at best given lip service- by the "issue of national question" with illusions of "new alternative" to the question and followed by its promotion worldwide. Mainly what promoted was (and is) a caricature of Marxism Leninism ; Bookchin-ism with the dressing of Leninism in an unseen form of practice of eclecticism. Referring back;

> Then, about the internationalists. In one of your recent editorials, you enumerated those organisations which, in your opinion, hold an internationalist stand. High on that list is-the Bund. We would like to know what grounds you have to number the Bund among the internationalists. The resolution of its Central Committee does not contain a single definite word on the major problems of socialism. It breathes a most unprincipled eclecticism. The Bund's organ (Information Bulletin) indubitably adheres to the standpoint of Germanophile chauvinism, or else gives a "synthesis" of French and German chauvinism. It was with good reason that an article by Kosovsky adorned the pages of Die Neue Zeit, a journal which (we hope you agree with us on this) is now among the most disreputable of the so-called "socialist" press organs." (8)

Some even have gone as far as defending a "federalism" based on "ethnicity" overreaching the existing boundaries of not one country but of four countries. The aim of uniting and building a country on an ethnic basis that overreaches the existing boundaries cannot be defended without sinking into the swamp of chauvinism and nationalism. That cannot be a "progressive" aim but a "reactionary" aim.

> "I am very worried that part of the Letts are for cultural-national autonomy, or wavering, for Bundist federalism, or wavering, hesitating to attack the nationalism and separatism of the Bund" (9)

İt was not, again, a surprise that the Trotskyites were in support of this approach, for the Trots had been the core supplier of "fabricated" theories for the ethnic- ML organizations in their search for theories fitting their anti- ML practice as early as late 1970s. Referring back in regard to both above;

> From this alone the German comrades can see how shamelessly the Letts, the Bund, Trotsky, and sundry private "informants" are deceiving them. It is clearly a matter of enabling the same Trotsky, the Bund, the Letts, or the Caucasians to lay hands on the money on behalf of Angeblichen "organisations", whose existence neither the Vorstand nor anyone else can prove or verify. *(10)*

"In Russia, as it happens, all the Jewish bourgeois parties (as well as the Bund, which actually follows in their wake) adopted the programme of "extra-territorial (cultural-national) autonomy",.. The Bund's nationalist vacillations were formally and unequivocally condemned long ago by the Second (1903) Congress, which flatly rejected the amendment moved by the Bundist Goldblatt on "the setting up of institutions guaranteeing freedom of development for the nationalities" (a pseudonym for "cultural-national autonomy")." (11)

Now we come to the "splits" of parties and organizations especially 1990s forward -with some possible exceptions- purely opportunistic reasons and ethnic subjectivity. The trend was to take advantage of situation where the "bourgeois nationalism" gaining grounds speedily and the "market" was open to grab "followers" , make agreements with bourgeois

nationalist movement, and in some cases to "confiscate " the resources as they split. Referring back;

> The Mensheviks at present are stronger than we are; it's going to be a long and hard fight. The icons abroad[Menshevik leaders] raise a heap of money. I consider it simply indecent for us to raise the question of an agreement with the Bund, etc., after their (and the Lettish) conference with the C.C.[This refers to a conference of representatives of the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P., the Bund, the Lettish S.D.L.P., and the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party held abroad in January 1905] (minutes in Posledniye Izvestia and in Iskra No. 89). It would be idiocy; it would look as if we were thrusting ourselves upon them. We shall be told: we don't know you, we have already reached agreement with the C.C. It will end in disgrace, believe me! " (12)

İn some cases liquidationist practice was so similar yet occasionally upside down to Russian historical experience. The reasons given for the liquidation and-or split varied from practical differences to differences going as far as being ridiculously irrelevant. As one of the comrade from an organization who was involved in discussion summarizes; "they could not come out and indicate the core of reason because they knew well that would be exposing their opportunism, so they have chosen a disputed subject that has no importance for the current tasks but of a subject related to the "communist society" which even Marx and Engels called it would be ridiculous to discuss something related to a communist society at this stage. " So the purpose of bringing about disputes that are in no way decisive on the current struggle was to find an excuse and justify their liquidationist practice. Referring back Lenin was saying;

> Liquidationism is "a deliberately vague, maliciously indefinite catchword", asserts a leading article in Golos. Maximov asserts that Proletary magnifies and inflates practical differences of opinion with the ultimatumists until they become differences in principle. Poor Golos! So far it has been able to lay the blame for all "malicious invention" on the Bolsheviks, i.e., on its "factional opponents". Now it is Plekhanov and the Bund that have to. be charged with malicious invention. Is it Plekhanov and the Bundists or is it Golos who "maliciously" prevaricates; which is more likely to be true?
>
> Liquidationism is a deep-seated social phenomenon, indissolubly connected with the counter-revolutionary mood of the liberal bourgeoisie, with disintegration and break up in the democratic petty bourgeoisie. The liberals and petty-bourgeois democrats are trying in thousands of ways to demoralise the revolutionary Social-Democratic Party, to undermine and overthrow it, to clear the way for legal workers' associations in which they might achieve success. And in a time like this the liquidators are ideologically and organizationally fighting against the most important remainder of the revolution of yesterday, against the most important bulwark of the revolution of tomorrow." (13)

Was there a struggle against the opportunism during this period of splits, forming new parties, organizations? Yes, but unfortunately mostly as individual efforts, since almost all existing parties and organizations were going through similar liquidationist practices in different degrees. Following the splits and new formations, opportunists dominated the field with their ethnically subjective theories fitting their practice. It

has become the era of opportunism and bourgeois nationalism in where the picture of it was drawn with Marxist Leninist brush. Considering most of the leadership cadres were residing in European countries, the resemblance is quite striking to the Russian history in that aspect.

"In the national question the old Iskra, which in 1901–03 worked on and completed a programme for the R.S.D.L.P. as well as laying the first and fundamental basis of Marxism in the theory and practice of the Russian working-class movement, had to struggle, in the same way as on other questions, against petty-bourgeois opportunism. This opportunism was expressed, first and foremost, in the nationalist tendencies and waverings of the Bund. The old Iskra conducted a stubborn struggle against Bund nationalism, and to forget this is tantamount to becoming a Forgetful John again, and cutting oneself off from the historical and ideological roots of the whole Social-Democratic workers' movement in Russia.

On the other hand, when the Programme of the R.S.D.L.P. was finally adopted at the Second Congress in August 1903, there was a struggle, unrecorded in the Minutes of the Congress because it took place in the Programme Commission, which was visited by almost the entire Congress—a struggle against the clumsy attempts of several Polish Social-Democrats to cast doubts on "the right, of nations to self-determination", i.e., attempts to deviate towards opportunism and nationalism from a quite different angle.

And today, ten years later, the struggle goes on along those same two basic lines, which shows equally that there is a profound connection between this struggle and all the objective conditions affecting the national question in Russia…

In Russia—as usual—people have been found who have made it their business to enlarge on a little opportunist error and

develop it into a system of opportunist policy. In the same way as Bernstein in Germany brought into being the Right Constitutional-Democrats in Russia—Struve, Bulgakov, Tugan & Co.—so Otto Bauer's "forgetfulness of internationalism" (as the super cautious Kautsky calls it!) gave rise in Russia to the complete acceptance of "cultural national autonomy" by all the Jewish bourgeois parties and a large number of petty-bourgeois trends (the Bund and a conference of Socialist-Revolutionary national parties in 1907). Backward Russia serves, one might say, as an example of how the microbes of West-European opportunism produce whole epidemics on our savage soil." (14)

Opportunism was (and still is) so dominant, widespread, and powerful that neither the large, somewhat chauvinist party nor the petty bourgeois, middle of the road large organization could protect themselves from similar splits. The core reasons of splits have become so apparent on their articles and approaches to daily events for any seeing eyes.

"As for the O.C. (R.S.D.L.P), the conference reaffirms that its main group, which is in Russia, and also its literary representative take the social-patriotic standpoint, and that its weak internationalist wing has neither the strength nor the courage to break with the social-patriots, and that the O.C. Centre takes the pacifist standpoint; the conference considers that the attitude of the Social-Democrats of Poland and Lithuania to the O.C. can consist exclusively of criticism of its position, promoting its disintegration and separating from the O.C. its internationalist elements grouped around Nashe Slovo, an organ which has done a great deal to elaborate internationalist-revolutionary views in the ranks of the R.S.D.L.P.

> "The same applies, in particular, also to the Bund, which is a part of the O.C., for its attitude is an even greater

> chaotic mixture of social-patriotic and pacifist, Russophile and Germanophile elements."(15)

All these splits, like in Russian history has shown, was " to the joy of those nationalist elements (the Bund) .. as the "adaptation of socialism to nationalism." Lenin, The Split in the Russian Social-Democratic Duma Group İnteresting enough while the Bourgeois Nationalist movement do not demand a secession but compromise with the bourgeoisie of Nation-State to extract privileges for its own bourgeoisie, most of the "Bundists" call for secession from all surrounding countries for a larger feudal supported bourgeois state on ethnic base. Although they quote Lenin for such claim, they hide the core of Lenin's words; the working class,

> The class-conscious workers do not advocate secession. They know the advantages of large states and the amalgamation of large masses of workers. But large states can be democratic only if there is complete equality among the nations; that equality implies the right to secede." (16)

As in Turkey, it has been the inevitable practice of the Bundists in history to replace the socialist struggle with nationalist struggle concealing the aim with Marxist Leninist phrases. Some even openly supported the bourgeois idea of "new alternative" (of course to socialism) defended by the Bourgeois Nationalists. " The liberal" said Lenin, " is not pleased that the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is regarded as the fundamental question. The liberal strives to ignite and fan the flames of national struggle in order to divert attention from the serious questions of democracy and socialism… Socialism actually does take first place .. It is ridiculous even to compare the struggle of the proletariat for socialism, a world phenomenon, with the struggle of one of the oppressed nations against the reactionary bourgeoisie that oppresses it. " (17)

As conclusion, Marxist Leninist have faced two dilemma for the question of right to self-determination; one is the attitude towards the Bourgeois Nationalist Movement the other is the attitude towards Bundist – tacit nationalists with Marxist Leninist mask. For the former the basic principles are clearly stated for the recognition and support; "it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness." Lenin Cultural national Autonomy - Critical Remarks on the National Question As far as the demand for secession; "The proletariat is opposed to such practicality. While recognizing equality and equal rights to a national state, it values above all and places foremost the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and assesses any national demand, any national separation, from the angle of the workers' class struggle. This call for practicality (to say yes to demand) is in fact merely a call for uncritical acceptance of bourgeois aspirations ." (18)

For the latter, due to its Marxist Leninist mask, it is not easy for the large masses to see their true faces and thus it is not an easy task to expose them since their opportunism directed to and leads to a large followers of their nationalistic views of the same. Mentioning Stalin's article, Lenin states;

> "Koba had time to write a big article on the nationalities problem. Good! We must fight for the truth against the separatists and opportunists of the Bund and among the liquidators." *(10)*

Liberalism, as it reflects in avoiding criticizing and exposing the "wrongs", is the worst enemy of Marxism Leninism, and the most dangerous for the socialist struggle. Fighting against opportunism, especially of this kind, cannot be avoided for "subjective" and-or "calculated" reasoning, for that kind of liberalism is the very definition of opportunism. It is a long

bumpy road that Marxist Leninist have to go through without fear, without subjectivity in order to clean herself up from every right and left trends, especially from the "nationalist" views.

Whatever level theoretical knowledge a man may have, in the final analysis, what makes him a Marxist-Leninist is that he has freed himself from his ethnic subjectivity.

Notes and Related Articles to Read

(1) From the note Lenin, The Black Hundreds, and the Organisation of an Uprising

(2) From the note Lenin, The Black Hundreds, and the Organisation of an Uprising

(3) Lenin, On Bolshevism

(4) To: Yekaterina Alexandrova, Private, from Lenin

(5) Lenin, We Are Thankful For Such Frankness

(6) Lenin, To: P. A. Krasikov

(7) Lenin, Reply to Liquidators' Article in Leipziger Volkszeitung

(8) Lenin Letter from the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. to The Editors of Nashe Slovo

(9) Lenin, To: I. E. Herman

(10) Lenin, To: L. B. Kamenev

(11) Lenin, A Contribution to the History of the National Programme in Austria and in Russia

(12) Lenin, To: S. I. Gusev, To Nation from Lenin

(13) Lenin, Methods of the Liquidators and Party Tasks of the Bolsheviks

(14) Lenin, The National Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.

(15) Lenin, Letter From the Committee of Organisations Abroad to the Sections of the R.S.D.L.P.

(16) Lenin, More About "Nationalism

(17) Lenin, Vekhi Contributors and Nationalism

(18) Lenin Practicality on National Question

Lenin: 15. To P. B. Axelrod 1901 -P23

Lenin: To I. I. Radchenko 1902- P28

Lenin: Does the Jewish Proletariat Need an 'Independent Party? 1903 – P30

Lenin: To G. M. Krzhizhanovsky1903 – P37

Lenin: The Position of the Bund in the Party 1903 – P39

Lenin: Concerning the Statement of the Bund 1903- P54

Lenin: The National Question in Our Programme 1903 -P62

Lenin: 2nd congress : Speech on the Place of the Bund 1903- P74

Lenin: The Latest Word in Bundist Nationalism 1903- P78

Lenin: Maximum Brazenness and Minimum Logic 1903 -P83

Lenin: To the Jewish Workers 1905 – P91

Lenin: Account of the Second Congress of the RSDLP 1903- P95

Lenin, Cultural National Economy – P129

Lenin: The Theory of Spontaneous Generation 1905 -P134

Lenin: No Falsehood! Our Strength Lies in Stating the Truth - 1905- P141

Lenin: An Irate Reply 1905 – P147

Lenin: Report on the Unity Congress of the RSDLP, 1906 -P148

Lenin: The Climax of the Party Crisis 1911- P155

Lenin: The Anonymous Writer in Vorwärts and the State of Affairs in the R.S.D.L.P 1912- P170

Lenin: 'Uniters' 1912 -P182

Lenin: Union of the Bund with the RSDLP,1906 -P187

Lenin: Concerning an Article Published in the Organ of the Bund 1906- P190

Lenin: To I. A. Pyantnitsky 1913 – P200

Lenin: Separatists in Russia and Separatists in Austria 1913- P205

Lenin: Has Pravda Given Proof of Bundist Separatism? 1913 - P208

Lenin: Theses on the National Question 1913- P211

Lenin: A Contribution to the History of the National Programme 1914 – P222

Lenin: On the London Conference 1915- P228

Lenin: Lost in a Wood of Three Trees 1916- P232

Lenin, Cultural National Economy- P235

Lenin, Liberals, and democrats on the language question 1913 - P250

Lenin: "National Culture"- P254

Lenin, The nationalist Bogey of “assimilation 1913- P259

Stalin, The Bund, It’s Nationalism , it’s separatism – P268

Socialism in one country

Internet is full of - actually over 8 million - writings about" Socialism in one country "being a theory put forth by Joseph Stalin, " being a betrayal of Leninist theory" etc. This is not a coincidence but an inevitable result of ideological struggle between the bourgeoisie, their servile petty bourgeois and Marxism Leninism as the ideology of laboring masses. It is one of the cheap falsification of history, distortion of facts, simply: cheap propaganda directed at average people and petty bourgeois intellectuals in return which makes it possible for the petty bourgeois and the reaction to hide behind "leftist" mask and gives them the opportunity to attack Socialist theories as "critics from the left" without appearing as reactionary.

Their master Trotsky who supplied a vast material to imperialists and anti-communists to fight against communism, also supplied the tactics for it. According to Trotsky, the pioneer of this lie:

> "Lenin was only referring to the establishment of a 'proletarian dictatorship' in a single country". (1)

And same Trotsky said:

> Lenin said ; "For the success of socialism in Russia a certain period of time of at least a few months is necessary."
>
> ""I remember very well how during the first period, in the Smolny, Lenin repeated time and time again in the Council of People's Commissars: half a year from now we'll have socialism and we'll be the most powerful state on earth… He believed what he said. " (2)

With this statement, according to Trotsky Lenin believed in "Socialism in One country". Then it was not a "betrayal to

Leninism" on Stalin's part, but it was the continuation of Lenin's believe, and Stalin interpreted Lenin's views correctly.

Let's go back to history of the theory where "Socialism in one country" has become the theory and practical solution for an isolated revolutionary state.

Lenin's theory of "socialism in one country" goes back to 1915 where even contrary to the distorted view, Lenin was not "merely referring to socialist revolution in one country," * but also contrary to views of scholars such as Carr, Lenin was referring to the possibility of constructing a socialist economy in a single country. *Carr, A History, and some others,

Lenin, in his article `on the slogan for a US of Europe, clearly states his view which is ignored stubbornly in all discussions. Lenin says:

> "After expropriating the capitalists and organizing their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise against the rest of the world—the capitalist world—attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states." (3)

Lenin was clearly stating that for an isolated revolutionary state, it would be feasible to build a socialist economy.

Lenin's referenced article debating the slogan, published at Sotsial-Demokrat No. 44, August 23, 1915. Lenin was stating that:

> "It might lead to an incorrect interpretation concerning the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country and concerning the relationship of such a country with the others. The unevenness of economic

> and political development is an unconditional law of capitalism. It follows from this that the victory of socialism initially in several or even in one, separately taken capitalist country is possible. Having expropriated the capitalists and having organised socialist production at home, the victorious proletariat of this country would rise against the remaining capitalist world… in case of need even coming out with military force against the exploiting classes and their states… The free unification of nations in socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged, stubborn struggle of socialist republics against the backward states. " (3)

Through this article Lenin was suggesting that before engaging in revolutionary world war, the victorious proletariat, the proletarian dictatorship would have to build a socialist economy at home. This suggestion of Lenin clearly derives from the belief that the victory of socialism in one country is possible.

Regarding the same issue, Engels was telling to Kautsky in his 12 September 1882 dated letter:

> "One thing alone is certain: the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing. Which of course by no means excludes defensive wars of various kinds. " (4)

Lenin in his article dated September 1916'The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution referring to Engels was stating :

> ""the victory of socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all wars in general. On the contrary, it presupposes wars. The development of capitalism

> proceeds extremely unevenly in different countries. It cannot be otherwise under commodity production. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This is bound to create not only friction, but a direct attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victorious proletariat. In such cases, a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. Engels was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky of September 12, 1882, he clearly stated that it was possible for already victorious socialism to wage "defensive wars". What he had in mind was defense of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries. " *(5)*

He continued saying:

> 'Only after we will have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie in the whole world, and not only in one country, wars will become impossible.' *(5)*

On another article dated October 1916 Lenin says:

> "Wars are possible between one country in which socialism has been victorious and other, bourgeois or reactionary, countries.'" *(6)*

In July 1916, Lenin said:

> "An economic revolution will be a stimulus to all peoples to strive for socialism; but at the same time

(counter) revolutions—against the socialist state—and wars are possible." (7)

As it is indisputably shown from the above quotations, the concept of "socialism in one country" is not a theory put forward by Stalin, but it is a Leninist theory.

It is the falsification and cheap propaganda of permanent-counter revolutionaries who choose to wait indefinitely for an "international revolution" to come, yet at the same time attack those who fight for revolution.

In 1918 Lenin was mentioning this type of bourgeois servile:

> "…when we are told that the victory of socialism is possible only on a world scale, we regard this merely as an attempt, a particularly hopeless attempt, on the part of the bourgeoisie and its voluntary and involuntary supporters to distort the irrefutable truth." (8)

And same year He mentions the permanent- revolution-waiters:

> "I know that there are, of course, sages who think they are very clever and even call themselves Socialists, who assert that power should not have been seized until the revolution had broken out in all countries. They do not suspect that by speaking in this way they are deserting the revolution and going over to the side of the bourgeoisie. To wait until the toiling classes, bring about a revolution on an international scale means that everybody should stand stock-still in expectation. That is nonsense." (9)

> As the facts come out and their lie are confronted, they choose new tactics, new lies and they create new confusions. They extract quotes for the "impossibility of socialism in one country by confusing socialism- first

phase, and communism - second phase, to one of which Lenin responds:

> ""when a learned professor, followed by the philistine..., talks of wild utopias, of the demagogic promises of the Bolsheviks, of the impossibility of "introducing" socialism, it is the higher stage, or phase, of communism he has in mind, which no one has ever promised or even thought to "introduce", because, generally speaking, it cannot be "introduced".
>
> What is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the "first", or lower, phase of communist society. Insofar as the means of production becomes common property, the word "communism" is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is not complete communism." -higher stage. (10)

Lenin in his speech was confirming both what socialism is and the existence of socialism in Russia, in one country.

> "Socialism is the first stage of communism: but it is not worthwhile arguing about words.....We must save the worker even if they are unable to work. If we keep them alive for the next few years, we shall save the country, save society and socialism." (11)

January 1918, at the Third All-Union Congress of Soviets, Lenin said that the Soviet republic is a socialist republic:

> "We never had any illusions on that score, and we know how difficult is the road that leads from capitalism to socialism. But it is our duty to say that our Soviet Republic is a socialist republic because we have taken this road, and our words will not be empty words." (12)

And a year later in 1919 repeats that:

> "We have achieved this objective in one country, and this confronts us with a second task. Since Soviet power has been established, since the bourgeoisie has been overthrown in one country, the second task is to wage the struggle on a world scale, on a different plane, the struggle of the proletarian state surrounded by capitalist states." (13)

In 1922 Lenin says:

> "Socialism is no longer a matter of the distant future, or an abstract picture, or an icon. We still retain our old bad opinion of icons. We have dragged socialism into everyday life, and here we must find our way. " (14)

In 1923 Lenin responses to the critiques:

> You say that civilization is necessary for the building of socialism. Very good. But why could we not first create such prerequisites of civilization in our country by the expulsion of the landowners and the Russian capitalists, and then start moving toward socialism? Where, in what books, have you read that such variations of the customary historical sequence of events are impermissible or impossible?" (15)

" Socialism in one country " has been Lenin's thinking since 1915.

As the truth comes out, some bourgeois revisionists accept the fact that it was Lenin's theory and adapt themselves to, and come up with new claims, one of which is that Lenin's views lack the coherence, that he contradicts himself by rejecting in one writing and then accepting in another. Aside from being a blatant ignorant of Marxist Dialectics on their part, the claim is related to their tactics in confusing the scientific meaning of socialism and communism where they take the "terms" used by

Lenin or Stalin out of context and without any regard to the "two phase of transition" - Lower and higher phase.

Lenin clearly explains the reason of the use of term " Communism":

> “Insofar as the means of production become common property,” Lenin says, “the word ‘communism’ is also applicable here," but Lenin warns: " provided we do not forget that this is not complete communism.” (16)

Another related lie is presented in various forms - of Lenin's belief that there is no possibility of long-term peaceful coexistence between the single socialist state and the capitalist world, but "Stalin believed that the isolated socialist state could in principle coexist indefinitely with the capitalist states."

Since they never read Stalin, they discourage people to read Stalin and encourage them to believe in their lies, we should note what Stalin said on the subject with the quote from Lenin:

This is what Lenin says on this score:

> "We are living not merely in a State but in a system of States, and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to coexist for a long period side by side with imperialist States. Ultimately one or other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois States is inevitable. This means that if the proletariat, as the ruling class, wants to and will rule, it must prove this also by military organization." (17)

And further:

> "We are surrounded by people, classes and governments which openly express their hatred for us.

We must remember that we are at all times but a hair's breadth from invasion." (17)

Indeed, it would be ridiculous and stupid to close our eyes to the capitalist encirclement and to think that our external enemies, the fascists, for example, will not, if the opportunity arises, make an attempt at a military attack upon the U.S.S.R. Only blind braggarts or masked enemies who desire to lull the vigilance of our people can think like that.

No less ridiculous would it be to deny that in the event of the slightest success of military intervention, the interventionists would try to destroy the Soviet system in the districts they occupied and restore the bourgeois system. `` Stalin, On the Final Victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.

Struggle against capitalism at the same time is an ideological struggle. That is why, it is expected that those who owns the means of production, owning at the same time the means of mental production will do anything in their power, use every means and methods in this ideological war. They will bury the facts under millions of garbage in internet , on the shelves of libraries, they will prepare a list of `reactionary` data disguised in left phrases for the university students for their thesis in related subject, they will pay and award those academicians who can "rewrite the history" and "falsify, revise " the theories serving best to their interests. The truth is stubborn. Stalin had said:

"I know that after my death a pile of rubbish will be heaped on my grave, but the wind of History will sooner or later sweep it away without mercy." *Quoted in Felix Chuev, Molotov Remembers.*

Notes and Related Articles to Read

(1) Trotsky, The Third International

(2) Trotsky, On Lenin

(3) Lenin, On the Slogan for a US of Europe 42

(4) Engels to Kautsky 48

(5)Lenin, The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution 50

(6) Lenin, The "Disarmament" Slogan 55

(7) Lenin, The Discussion On Self-Determination Summed Up

(8)Lenin, "Speech to the Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets"

(9)Lenin, "Speech delivered at a joint meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet

(10) Lenin, State, and revolution 109

(11) Lenin, First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education 120

(12) Lenin, Third All-Russia Congress Of Soviets Of Workers', Soldiers' And Peasants' Deputies

(13) Lenin, "The Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government"

(14) Lenin, Speech At A Plenary Session Of The Moscow Soviet 187

(15) Lenin, "Our Revolution"

(16) Lenin, Presentation of the Question by Marx

(17) Stalin, On the Final Victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. 197

Trotsky, An answer to Stalinist Critics 14

Trotsky, Forming The Government 24

Lenin, Report on the Activities of Th CPC 58

Lenin, Report on Foreign Policy 84

Lenin, The Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government 140

Lenin vs Trotsky on Standing Army

In politics nothing is coincidental but a reflection of an ideology in one way or another. No matter how much the core ideology is masked, the actions will inevitably show the indications and bring the mask down and expose the real ideology behind it. From the time of split as Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1903, the opposition to the insurrection, opposition to the party, treatment of Military Commissars and favoring Tsarists officers, the "August Bloc", "Trotsky-Zinoviev Bloc", collaborating with the fascists and imperialists in different capacities in China, Vietnam, Spain, and other places was never a coincidence but an inevitable path of Trotsky's 'ideology. As Stalin asks;

> "Is it an accident that Trotsky who, after the Revolution made his way into the ranks of our Party, slipped up and adopted a counter-revolutionary Menshevik position and was thrown out beyond the borders of our state, beyond the borders of the Soviet Union?" (1)

Vyshinsky actually responded to this question at the court;

> "It is not an accident because prior to the October Revolution as well, Trotsky and his friends fought against Lenin and Lenin's Party as they fight now against Stalin and the Party of Lenin and Stalin." (1)

The fact is that Trotsky never believed in the possibility of Socialism, not only in one country, but socialism in general since there is no possibility of a world revolution at one leap, at one strike. Trotsky believed in Military dictatorship of an elite group, not as much different than that of Mussolini's or Hitler's with exporting "revolutions" in mind. For Trotsky working class is a means to the military dictatorship of elite not the dictatorship of working class.

Although years later he revised in words only, but not indeed, here what Trotsky says:

> "In its real significance, a revolution is a fight for control of the State. That rests directly on the Army. This is why all revolutions in history sharply raised the question: on whose side is the army? And one way or another, in every case, this question had to be answered." (2)

Without twisting his words, two of these remarks are crucial as far as Marxist Leninists are concerned; 1) revolution" rests directly on the Army" and 2) "whose side is the army".

If we talk about an army, and mentioning the "side" it will take, we are, without any doubt, talking about an existing standing army and literally saying that the success of a revolution "rests directly on this Army".

Let's start with what is an Army in view of Marxism Leninism

As far back as to 1899, Rosa Luxemburg was saying;

> "The most general standpoint upon which Schippel bases his defense of militarism is his belief in the necessity of this military system. Using all possible arguments of a technical, social, and economic nature, he demonstrates the absolute necessity of a standing army. And from a certain point of view he is quite correct. A standing army and militarism are indeed indispensable – but for whom? For the present-day ruling classes and the contemporary governments.
>
> Now what can one conclude from this other than that, from the class standpoint of the present government and ruling classes, doing away with the standing army and introducing the militia, i.e. arming the people, must appear to be an impossibility, an absurdity?" (3)

And same year James Connolly was saying;

> “A standing army anywhere, in any country, is first of all unnecessary; secondly, a tool in the hands of oppressors of the people” (4)

To the question of What is an army? Lenin responds;

> " A standing army and police are the chief instruments of state power..... The centralized state power that is peculiar to bourgeois society came into being in the period of the fall of absolutism. Two institutions are most characteristic of this state machine: the bureaucracy and the standing army. In their works, Marx and Engels repeatedly show that it is the bourgeoisie with whom these institutions are connected by thousands of threads." (5)

> “We cannot, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, forget that we are living in a class society from which there is no way out, nor can there be, save through the class struggle. In every class society, whether based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at present, wage-labor, the oppressor class is always armed. Not only the modern standing army, but even the modern militia—and even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, Switzerland, for instance—represent the bourgeoisie armed against the proletariat. That is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon it.” (6)

Reading Trotsky's remarks, he is resting the success of a revolution on the "question of "whose side the army" will be, an army which Lenin describes as a "parasite" on the body of bourgeois society. "

What do Marxist Leninists do with Army?

“The capitalists now have directed all their efforts at making the Russian republic as much like a monarchy as possible so that it might be changed back into a monarchy with the least difficulty (this has happened time and again in many countries). For this purpose, “says Lenin, “the capitalists want to preserve the bureaucracy, which stands above the people, to preserve the police and the standing army, which is separated from the people and commanded by non-elective generals and other officers. And the generals and other officers, unless they are elected, will almost invariably be landowners and capitalists. That much we know from the experience of all the republics in the world.

Our Party, the party of class-conscious workers and poor peasants, is therefore working for a democratic republic of another kind. We want a republic where there is no police that browbeats the people; where all officials, from the bottom up, are elective and displaceable whenever the people demand it, and are paid salaries not higher than the wages of a competent worker; where all army officers are similarly elective and where the standing army separated from the people and subordinated to classes alien to the people is replaced by the universally armed people, by a people’s militia.” (7)

Trotsky not only suggests the cooperation with the army but reconstructing and "partly" dismissing the army. Here what he says;

> “To establish revolutionary cooperation with the army, the peasantry, and the plebeian lower strata of the urban bourgeoisie. To abolish absolutism. To destroy the material organization of absolutism by reconstructing and partly dismissing the army. (8)

Lenin, however, speaks of the "abolition" of the standing army and "arming the people." Here what Lenin says;

> "... The first decree of the Commune . . . was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people." This demand now figures in the program of every party claiming the name of Socialist.
>
> "The Commune," Marx wrote, "made that catchword of bourgeois revolutions, cheap government, a reality, by destroying the two greatest sources of expenditure -
>
> - the standing army and State functionalism." (9)

The question of army is not separated from the question of state. State apparatus needs to be smashed, all other institutions need to be wrested from the capitalist control, for the use and benefit of the new. Trotsky looks at the question differently. His admiration for army goes so far as that the insurrection was against the commanding army staff not to Monarchy, and if the "bad apples" in the army are cleaned, the army, serving the society, could be revived.

> "In the minds of the soldiers the insurrection against the monarchy was primarily an insurrection against the commanding staff.
>
> An army is always a copy of the society it serves – with this difference, that it gives social relations a concentrated character, carrying both their positive and negative features to an extreme.
>
> The ill-will and friction between the democratic and aristocratic officers, incapable of reviving the army, only introduced a further element of decomposition. Even many fighting officers, those who seriously cared about the fate of the army, insisted upon the necessity of a general clean-up of the commanding staff." (10)

Lenin however finds this approach of not replacing but a "general clean-up" as a deception and trick in the service of bourgeoisie.

> "The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people… it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would "not be enough" arms to go around, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organising a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is "not enough" to go around, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army… The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should merge into a single militia consisting of all the people. Failing this, the apparatus of oppression will remain in force…, Replacement of the old organs of oppression, the police, the bureaucracy, the standing army, by a universal arming of the people, by a really universal militia, is the only way to guarantee the country a maximum of security against the restoration.
>
> Public service through a police force standing above the people, through bureaucrats, who are the most faithful servants of the bourgeoisie, and through a standing army under the command of landowners and capitalists—that is the ideal of the bourgeois

> parliamentary republic, which is out to perpetuate the rule of Capital.
>
> Public service through a really universal people's militia, composed of men and women, a militia capable partly of replacing the bureaucrats—this, combined with the principle of elective office and displaceability of all public officers, with payment for their work according to proletarian, not "master-class", bourgeois standards, is the ideal of the working class." (11)

Countering the bourgeois demand of keeping or "cleaning-up of the standing army under the command of landowners and capitalists, Lenin explaining the soldiers demands and intentions states;

> "The soldiers do not want to keep out of politics. The soldiers do not agree with the Cadets. The soldiers are advancing a demand that obviously amounts to the abolition of the caste army, of the army that is isolated from the people, and its replacement by an army of free and equal citizens. Now this is exactly the same thing as the abolition of the standing army and the arming of the people.
>
> They are demanding freedom of assembly and of association for soldiers "without the consent or presence of officers". (12)

Lenin in connection with that, defends arming of people;

> "the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party advances as its immediate political task the over throw of the tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a republic based on a democratic constitution that would ensure: general arming of the people instead of maintaining a standing army;" (13)

> "The Soviets are a new state apparatus which, in the first place, provides an armed force of workers and peasants; and this force is not divorced from the people.. From the military point of view this force is incomparably more powerful than previous forces; from the revolutionary point of view, it cannot be replaced by anything else." (14)

Trotsky says;

> "Territorial-economic districts must form the basis both of the Soviet territorial-administrative system (region, province, uyezd, volost) and of the local military organs (commissariats), in the course of the gradual transition from the standing army to the militia." (15)

Lenin says;

> "Everywhere, in all countries, the standing army is used not so much against the external enemy as against the internal enemy. Everywhere the standing army has become the weapon of reaction, the servant of capital in its struggle against labour, the executioner of the people's liberty. Let us not, therefore, stop short at mere partial demands in our great liberating revolution. Let us tear the evil up by the roots. Let us do away with the standing army altogether…. The experience of Western Europe has shown how utterly reactionary the standing army is." (16)

> "We are in favour of a people's republic, without a standing army, bureaucracy, or police force. In place of a standing army we demand a national guard with elected commanders." (17)

Another staunch Trotskyite, General Tukhachevsky spells out the Trotskyite, anti-Marxist view of "exporting of revolution by

force, by means of war". During the heated discussions between the supporters of the militia system and the advocates of a standing army, the chief spokesman for the standing army was Tukhachevsky. He published a polemic entitled "The Red Army and the Militia" in January 1921, in which he states;

> "The adherents of the militia system take absolutely no account of Soviet Russia's present military mission of disseminating socialist revolution throughout the world. The rich varieties of socialist life and the socialist revolution cannot be forced into any particular framework. They will spread irresistibly over the whole world, and their expanding force will endure so long as there is a bourgeoisie left anywhere.
>
> "What is the way in which they will best achieve their aims? It is the way of armed insurrection within every state, or the way of armed socialist attacks on bourgeois states, or a combination of both ways. No one can make definite prophecies, for the course of the Revolution will show us the right way. One thing, however, is certain: if a socialist revolution succeeds in gaining power in any country, it will have a self-evident right to expand, and will strive to cover the whole world by making its immediate influence felt in all neighboring countries. Its most powerful instrument will naturally be its military forces.
>
> "The structure of an army is determined on the one hand by the political aims it pursues and on the other by the recruiting system it employs." (18)

For Marxist Leninists, the question of exporting revolution by force or otherwise is fundamentally anti-Marxist not even worth to debate.

Going back to March 1848, at a meeting of German Workers' Club in Paris, Marx opposes the adventurist "export of revolution" planned by the petty-bourgeois leaders of the German migrants in Paris. These quotes below should suffice to comprehend the Marxist Leninist attitude.

Engels;

> "One thing alone is certain: the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing. Which of course by no means excludes defensive wars of various kinds." (19)

Lenin;

> "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) this struggle, this, and only this, line, in every country without exception. Everything else is deception and Manilovism."(20)

Stalin;

> "The export of revolution is nonsense. Every country will make its own revolution if it wants to, and if it does not want to, there will be no revolution." (21)

Marxist Leninists do not expect and rely on the Army switching sides for the revolution. The success of the revolution depends largely on the revolutionary activity and the ability of the vanguard Party and the proletariat to organize and ally themselves with great masses of the other exploited and oppressed groups and classes of the population. Revolutionary activity does not exclude working among the soldiers, since

most of them belong either to the poor peasants or the middle strata. As Stalin puts it;

> ” The question of the middle strata is undoubtedly one of the basic questions of the workers' revolution… these are the strata whose economic status puts them midway between the proletariat and the capitalist class… they constitute the important reserves from which the capitalist class recruits its army against the proletariat. The proletariat cannot retain power unless it enjoys the sympathy and support of the middle strata, primarily of the peasantry.. The proletariat cannot even seriously contemplate seizing power if these strata have not been at least neutralized, if they have not yet managed to break away from the capitalist class, and if the bulk of them still serve as the army of capital.” (22)

Marxists, in addition to Party’s military cadres, arm the people and do not call on Army but soldiers, troopers. December 1905 Bolshevik Leaflet states;

> “Strictly differentiate between your conscious enemies and your unconscious and accidental enemies. Destroy the former and have mercy on the latter. If, possible do not bother the infantry. Soldiers are the children of the people and do not go against the people by their own will. The officers and the higher leadership set them on the people. Direct your energies against these officers and authorities. Every officer leading soldiers to beat workers proclaims himself an enemy of the people and puts himself outside the law. Kill him unconditionally.” (23)

As does Trotsky not in so many words but indeed, the bourgeoisie likes to describe any revolutionary uprising as something artificial, a military “putsch”, and try to minimize

the power of working masses. In reference to 1905 uprising, countering such arguments, Lenin says;

> "In reality, the inexorable trend of the Russian revolution was towards an armed, decisive battle between the tsarist government and the vanguard of the class-conscious proletariat." (24)

Neither Trotsky's relying on the switching of standing army for the success of revolution, nor Tukhachevsky's statement of "exporting of revolution" is accidental. As history has proven that it was an inevitable path derives from the ideology. It is not an accident but the reflection of ideology in practice, regardless of how skillfully disguised with Marxist Leninist phrases.

Army's switching side as the determining factor where the success of "revolution" rests directly on it, in fact corresponds to the concept of military "putsch". "The term "putsch", in its scientific sense, "says Lenin, "may be employed only when the attempt at insurrection has revealed nothing but a circle of conspirators or stupid maniacs and has aroused no sympathy among the masses." Giving example of Irish rebellion Lenin notes;

> "So, one army lines up in one place and says, "We are for socialism", and another, somewhere else and says, "We are for imperialism", and that will be a social revolution! Only those who hold such a ridiculously pedantic view could vilify the Irish rebellion by calling it a "putsch". (25)

An army in any given country is the chief instruments of state power. From top down all the officers controlling the army either a part of the ruling class or well-paid and receiving their lion share from the exploitation of natural resources and of laboring masses. To rest the success of revolution on the "switching side "of army, and to speak about cooperation with

army, and after the revolution "cleaning up "the bad apples and keeping the army cannot be proposed by a Marxist Leninist, but by a bourgeois. Marxist Leninists abolish the standing army and arm the people, set up revolutionary army in the process.

Notes and Related Articles to Read

(1) Vyshinsky, Court Proceedings

(2) Trotsky, The Young Turks – P98

(3) Rosa Luxemburg, The Militia and Militarism, (1899) - P18

(4) James Connolly, 'Soldiers of the Queen', (1899)

(5) Lenin, The state, and revolution

(6) Lenin, The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution, 1916 - P110

(7) Lenin, An Open Letter to the Delegates to the All-Russia Congress of Peasants' Deputies, May 17, 1917 - P144

(8) Trotsky, Our Revolution 1907, The Soviet and the Revolution – P81

(9) Lenin, The State and Revolution, with what is the smashed state machine to be replaced. – P178

(10) Trotsky, The History of the Russian Revolution , The Overthrow of Tzarism – P190

(11) Lenin, A Proletarian Militia May 3, 1917 – P139

(12) Lenin, The Army, and the People, 1906 – P63

(13) Lenin, Material for the Preparation of the Programme of the R.S.D.L.P. January-April 1902, Collected Works, Volume 6, pages 17-78.

(14) Lenin, Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power? October 1917 –P184

(15) Trotsky, The Transition to Universal Labour Service

(16) Lenin, The Armed Forces, and the Revolution 1905 – P29

(17) Stalin, The Constituent Assembly elections, July 27, 1917

(18) Tukhachevsky, The Red Army and the Militia

(19) Engels to Karl Kautsky In Vienna, 12 September 1882

(20) Lenin, The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution, (Draft Platform for the Proletarian Party), September 1917 – P160

(21) Interview Between J. Stalin and Roy Howard

(22) Stalin, The October Revolution, and the Question of the Middle Strata

(23) Combat Organization of the Moscow Committee of the RSDLP

(24) Lenin, Lecture on the 1905 revolution, January 9,1917

(25) Lenin: The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up

Lenin, To the Rural Poor 1903 – P24

Bolshevik Leaflet - Instructions on Guerrilla warfare – P 34

Lenin, Report on the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. 1906-P 38

Lenin, The Proletariat & its Ally in the Russian Revolution 1906– P67

Lenin, The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the

First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907, December 1907 – P88

Lenin, The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. 1908 – P 97

Lenin, The Bourgeoisie and Peace 1913 – P108

Lenin, Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Soldiers of the Izmailovsky Regiment April 10, 1917 – P 114

Lenin, The Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks), April 14–22, 1917 – P117

Lenin, Congress of Peasants' Deputies, April 16, 1917 – P119

Lenin, The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (B) April 24–29, 1917 – P124

Lenin, Our Views, May 1, 1917 -P133

Lenin, They Have Forgotten the Main Thing, May 18, 1917 – P150

Lenin, A Regrettable Deviation from the Principles of Democracy, May 25, 1917 – P155

Lenin, From Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat, July 1917 – P158

Lenin, The State & Revolution, The Revolution Summed Up – P165

Lenin, The State and Revolution - Special Bodies of Armed Men, Prisons, etc. – P 173

Reading Guide;

On Revolutionary Situation
On Imperialism
On Anti-Imperialist Wars
On Imperialist Wars and Bolsheviks
On Boycott
On Bureaucracy
On Compromise
On Democratic Struggle
On Parliamentarism and Parliamentary Struggle
On People Democracy, Insurrection & Revolutionary Democracy
On Reform and Reformism
On Restoration of Capitalism
On Right to Self Determination-National Question
On National Question and Bundists
On Socialism in One Country
On Standing Army

No Copyrights
Creative Commons ShareAlike (CC BY-S)